University of Alberta

The Trilby Phenomenon and Late Victorian Culture

by

Mary Elizabeth Leighton

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 2003

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitons et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 0-612-82132-3
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 0-612-82132-3

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou aturement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Mary Elizabeth Leighton

Title of Thesis: The Trilby Phenomenon and Late Victorian Culture

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

1-1019 Bank St.
Victoria, BC
V8S 4B3

10 February 2003

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *The Trilby Phenomenon and Late Victorian Culture* submitted by Mary Elizabeth Leighton in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Jo-Ann Wallace

Dr. Christine Wiesenthal

Dr. Susan Hamilton

Dr. Mark Simpson

Jan. 17, 2003

Dr. Lynn Penrod

Dr. Jill Matus

Abstract

This study explores the extent of Trilby's popularity and examines the historical and social conditions in which this popularity was produced. George Du Maurier's 1894 novel, about an artist's model who is refashioned as an opera diva under the hypnotic influence of the villainous Svengali, captured the public imagination upon its initial serialization. Trilby mania ensued: parodies were published, tie-in merchandise was flogged, and stage adaptations toured the U.S., Canada, and Great Britain. My study analyses the production and reception of Trilby by examining a series of late-Victorian cultural debates by which the novel was shaped and to which it contributed: the function and direction of a national English literature at a moment when the proponents of romance and realism were vying for aesthetic hegemony; the representation and employment conditions of the artist's model at a moment when artists were newly accepted in Society circles; the role of hypnotism in orthodox medicine and popular entertainment at a moment when medical men were seeking to consolidate their hard-won cultural authority; and the vilification of "the Jew" on the stage at a moment when the actor-manager system of theatre governance was giving way to more democratic forms of management. In each of these debates, I examine how the novel and its stage adaptations represented emergent and contested professional identities—the critic, the artist and the artist's model, the hypnotist, and the actor-manager. Trilby thus serves as a case study that refines our knowledges about late-Victorian discourses on sexuality and race, the history of reading and publishing practices, and theories of cultural transmission.

Acknowledgements

For financial support which made possible the research for and writing of this dissertation, I am grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada, the Department of English and the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Alberta, and the Canadian Federation of University Women.

The completion of this dissertation would have been impossible without the patience and encouragement of my supervisor, Jo-Ann Wallace. Her rigorous scholarship and intellectual commitments have inspired and moved me; she has been a model of academic integrity in the classroom and in her work, always combining meticulous research, scholarly generosity, and a sense of fun. I am also grateful for the thoughtful, stimulating contributions of Susan Hamilton, Christine Wiesenthal, Mark Simpson, Lynn Penrod, and Jill Matus.

As a member of The Concrete Matters Collective, I have had the good fortune to collaborate with four women who have challenged and supported me for many years. I have gratefully depended on the encouragement, intellectual stimulation, and community provided by Tracy Kulba, Janice Schroeder, Cheryl Suzack, and Lisa Ward Mather.

For comradeship, laughter, and crucial support, I thank Norman Friesen, Barbara Simler, Christopher Wiebe, and especially Janice Schroeder, whose care and solidarity always buoyed me when I was blue. I am also grateful to Karen Chrus, Kerry Markwick, and Marnie Rice, whose friendships have long sustained me across oceans and continents. Cheryl Suzack has been providing sage advice—intellectual and personal—for years; I am thankful for her provocations, support, and friendship. I am also thankful for my stimulating collaborations and fun conversations with Kirsten MacLeod over the years.

More recently, my colleagues at the University of Victoria have provided a warm and welcoming environment in which to work. I am thankful daily for the generosity, kindness, and companionship of Judith Mitchell and Lisa Surridge. Lisa Gould, Gweneth Doane, Susan Lewis, Leslie Butt, Quentin Mackie, and my fellow pre-tenure Friday regulars have redefined interdisciplinarity for me, cheering me with their encouragement, laughter, and postcards from the field.

I want also to acknowledge the contributions of my family. My father, Doug, a gifted teacher, continues to remind me of the value of intellectual work in the world. Derek Leaist has been making me laugh since my mother first met him over ten years ago; his levity always cheers me. And finally, words fail to express my gratitude for the love and support of three generations of women: my mother, Elizabeth, whose own life and work I so much admire; my sister, Kate, whose pride in me gives me great pleasure; and my niece, Valerie, who arrived on the first day of my first ever research trip and has made our lives more joyful ever since. This is for them.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Chapter One 15
The Critical Project of Romance:
George Du Maurier, Andrew Lang, and the Institution of English Literature

Chapter Two 45
Eminent Bohemians:
Fictions of the Artist, the Artist's Model, and Late-Victorian Studio Culture

Chapter Three 90
Under the Influence:
Victorian Medicine and Hypnotic Fictions of the *fin de siècle*

Chapter Four 160
Staging Identity:
The Role of Svengali in the Late-Victorian Theatre

Afterword 203

Bibliography 211

Introduction

In the spring of 1995, I often joked that I had taken up permanent residence in Special Collections at the University of Guelph, where I was working toward a Master's degree in English. As part of a course on turn-of-the-century Canadian writer L.M. Montgomery, I was assigned the perusal of two years of the Daily Patriot, the daily newspaper in Montgomery's hometown of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island. Beyond its temporal parameters, the assignment was capacious. I was to focus on any publications by or about Montgomery, but was encouraged to pay attention to any articles or correspondence pertinent to Montgomery's formation as a woman writer. The decision about which years of the newspaper to peruse was mine to make. For sentimental reasons I chose 1901, the year my maternal grandmother was born. Immediately, the Daily Patriot was fascinating reading for that year, owing to its coverage of Queen Victoria's death on 22 January. 1895 initially seemed less sensational by comparison, although coverage of the Wilde trials and the Riel Rebellion soon squelched this misconception. In retrospect, the 1895 press coverage yielded up its fascinations in an even more protracted fashion than I anticipated. I would spend the next six years eager to explore the popularity of a seemingly obscure novel whose cultural influence was felt even in the small community of Charlottetown.

The 1895 Daily Patriot evinced a typical amalgamation of local, national, and international interests in its representation of the news. On 12 January, for example, reports from London of the failures of Henry James's most recent play, Guy Domville, and Oscar Wilde's An Ideal Husband rubbed shoulders with the disturbing news of nine-year-old Martha Roach's "mysterious disappearance" from her home in Cape Breton.

Although I was to gear my attention to local news of the Montgomery family, I became increasingly fascinated by the newspaper's reviews of current literature and by the ways in which popular international fiction—generally American and British—was consumed locally. I was especially intrigued to trace accounts of George Du Maurier's Trilby, a novel unfamiliar to me, which described its popularity in the United States early in the year and eventually its local popularity in Charlottetown by the end of the year.

The first mention of Trilby in the 1895 Daily Patriot was a brief notice on 19 February which stated that the Board of Education in Philadelphia had approved the novel as "harmless and fitting for public libraries" (2). The question of this possible censorship piqued my curiosity about the novel's content, but I forged ahead with my newspaper research without giving it too much thought. When I reached May 1895, however, I discovered a flurry of articles about Trilby, and this time they were not limited to Du Maurier's novel. On 11 May I read an announcement that "Trilby" was to be performed at the local Opera House. The stage production, the announcement went on, followed the book closely as "the sensation of the year" (3). On 16 May, a notice discussed the race among publishers for an English translation of Nodier's 1822 French novel about a Scottish elf, Trilby, the Fairy of Argyle. The popularity of Du Maurier's Trilby had evidently given rise to a demand for products associated with the book, and publishers were eager to cash in by offering new editions of the novel's namesake. Two days later, on 18 May, the newspaper confirmed the popularity of the "Trilby" waist design in women's fashion. The design featured close bands of material that crossed in front over a plaited or gathered bodice. And on 21 May, the Daily Patriot proclaimed Du Maurier's Trilby "the craze of the century" and the "sensation of the age" (2).

And still, I had not read the novel. I recorded these notices as indications of the literary milieu of the period and moved on to another assignment, another course. But Trilby was not to be put aside so easily. On a fall afternoon in 1995, I ventured into a local junk store. To my delight, the proprietor explained that he had just received a new shipment of books from an estate sale. He had paid for the books by the pound. They were barely out of the boxes, and were stacked haphazardly around the store wherever there was a free shelf, an open table, an empty space where they could be piled. The hardbacks were priced to sell from one to five dollars. The task of sifting through stacks of dusty books was clearly not to be accommodated in a single perusal. One of my great pleasures that fall was the regular quick visit to survey a new stack of books, an unexamined corner of a bookshelf. It was there that I came upon a copy of Trilby and began the process of uncovering the nature and extent of the novel's popularity.

The copy that I purchased for a mere two dollars is the first American book edition, published in 1895 by Harper and Brothers Publishers of New York. It is a handsome, illustrated cloth volume which features an attractive cover and spine design. The focal point of the taupe cover is a circular green spider's web, complete with ominous-looking spider. Superimposed over the web is an embossed pair of gold wings and, at the web's centre, a gold heart. The book's title is announced at the top of the cover, under which is festooned a charming bower of flowers, ending with two ribbons that hang alongside the web design. On the left, the ribbon suspends a book and quill, and, on the right, a painter's palette and three brushes. The author's surname is printed under the web, between the book and the palette. The cover illustrations make explicit the themes that the novel will address: the centrality of transcendent love and its ability to

supercede the evil that spins its web around the main character, and the twin functions of art and fiction in relating this story to the reader. I reserved pride of place on my bookshelf for what I then presumed, erroneously, to be the first American edition of the novel. I continued with my studies, occasionally interrupting the daily work of writing and reading to take my copy of Trilby down from the shelf, run my hand lightly over its embossed cover, wonder how many readers before me had relished its neat symmetries and its pleasant heft in the hand. It is a delightful size, my copy of Trilby. The spine fits precisely in one's palm, running the length of the hand from heel to fingertip. As my Master's degree drew to completion, these appreciations of the book occurred with greater frequency. Trilby was rapidly becoming a fetish.

From Guelph, where I was studying, my bibliophilic tendencies often led me to Toronto, where I had long since established a circuit of preferred used bookstores. When, one afternoon, my favourite location yielded up a clothbound first edition of Leonée Ormond's biography of George Du Maurier, I began to feel ever so slightly superstitious about Trilby. From the Charlottetown Daily Patriot to my junk store first edition find to Du Maurier's biography, Trilby had taken tenacious hold of my scholarly imagination. Soon, I feared, the book would have me in its critical clutches. Just as Svengali brings Trilby under his control, I would "see nothing, hear nothing, feel nothing, but" Trilby, Trilby, Trilby. I felt compelled to find out more about the novel and its publication history. I polled people I knew. No one was familiar with the story, but as soon as I said "Svengali," people would nod their heads in recognition. Many assumed that the term Svengali, as a way of characterizing a villain, had preceded Du Maurier's novel, that the novel must have drawn on an idea of Svengali that was already in cultural circulation in

the nineteenth century. At that moment, I could neither confirm nor refute this claim, but I was curious to find out. The term Trilby was less recognizable to people, yet I soon hypothesized that recognition of "Trilby" as a term was contingent on age. Friends' parents knew "Trilby" as a kind of hat. My mother remembered that my grandmother had often called a fedora a "Trilby."

I arrived in Edmonton to begin doctoral work in the fall of 1996, eager to follow the trail of Trilby. A term paper that first semester provided me with a legitimate scholarly purpose in pursuing Trilby's publication history. But what started as a point of departure for one section of one chapter of my dissertation soon burgeoned into the subject of the dissertation itself. Fellow students would inquire about my topic. I recall once providing an expurgated version of my dissertation abstract to a new student seeking information about the program. "Are you *allowed* to write your dissertation on only one novel?" was the suspicious question that followed my synopsis.

The simple answer is that the publication and performance history of Trilby belies any easy ascription of textual singularity to it. From its inception, I conceived of this study as an analysis of the production and reception of Trilby in all its multifarious genres—from the original serialized version published in Harper's New Monthly Magazine to subsequent book editions, from early American stage adaptations to Herbert Beerbohm Tree's famous portrayal of Svengali, from printed parodies to music hall burlesques, and finally to early film adaptations. I wanted to situate Trilby in relation to changing modes of literary and theatrical production at the *fin de siècle* in order to understand first, the reasons for Trilby's enormous popularity, and second, Trilby's implication in received literary histories of the late-Victorian period, from which it had

been largely excluded. Over the last five years, the aims of my project have shifted. This is due equally to my changing intellectual interests as to renewed scholarly interest in Trilby, which at first provided a welcome context for my ongoing work and then struck fear in my heart as I worried increasingly about being scooped.

Trilby has once again become an industry: not the culture industry that it was between 1894 and 1897, but an academic cottage industry nonetheless. Since 1994, no less than four editions of the novel have appeared, as well as the publication of Paul Potter's stage adaptation of Du Maurier's novel in a collection of "Four Plays for Victorian Star Actors."[1] Publishers Penguin, Oxford, and J.M. Dent have each issued an edition of Trilby in the last seven years, both reflecting and contributing to Trilby's current popularity among scholars and readers.[2] After a fallow period of critical inattention to the novel, the stature of the editors of these recent editions—Daniel Pick, Elaine Showalter, and Leonee Ormond, respectively—indicates the seriousness with which Trilby has been taken up and the relevance of the novel to current studies and understandings of the *fin de siècle*. Trilby is back in vogue. Critical work by Dennis Denisoff, Emily Jenkins, and Daniel Pick—on homosociality in Du Maurier's illustrations, Trilby mania and book production, and the figure of the "alien enchanter" respectively—has by turns encouraged me and made me nervous, focusing as it has on the subject of my own academic project.

***

The story I have related here about my discovery of and fascination with Trilby is just one among many that punctuate my intellectual development in the institution. But, like the other stories I could tell, it figures this development as a narrative of

professionalization. What began as the piqued curiosity of a "Scholar Adventurer," to adopt Richard Altick's term, became the grounds for my professionalization as a graduate student—for the dissertation, for conference papers, for publications. Just as Trilby has figured prominently in the history of my own academic professionalization, so too did it participate in late-Victorian narratives of professionalization. By means of both its textual representations of emergent forms of professional identity at the *fin de siècle* and its participation, at the moment of its publication, in a series of debates about contested professional identities, Trilby functioned as a key text for the contestation and consolidation of particular late-Victorian professional identities. My study began as an effort to understand the nature and extent of Trilby's popularity. This aim has remained constant, but recent scholarship on Trilby and my own shifting critical impetus have forced me to refine my sense of the cultural work performed by Trilby and its readers.

In this study I examine the nature and extent of Trilby's popularity in relation to particular readers and to particular debates about emergent and contested professional identities: namely, the function and direction of a national English literature at a moment when the proponents of romance and realism were vying for aesthetic hegemony; the representation and employment conditions of the artist's model at a moment when artists were newly accepted in Society circles; the role of hypnotism in orthodox medicine and popular entertainment at a moment when medical men were seeking to consolidate their hard-won cultural authority; and the vilification of "the Jew" on the stage at a moment when the actor-manager system of theatre governance was giving way to more democratic forms of management.

The project of situating Trilby in relation to contemporary debates about emergent forms of professional identity is, of necessity, a materialist one. I understand materialism as both a field of critical inquiry and a methodology which has as its critical aim the explanation of cultural practices and representations relative to social relations of power.[3] For this understanding of materialism as a critical tool, I am indebted primarily to two scholarly communities: the feminist collective of which I have been a member for the last five years, and the virtual community of late-Victorian and modernist scholars, who have increasingly turned to materialist methodologies as a way of explaining shifting modes of literary production at the turn of the century. Working within and between these communities has provided me with a means of conceptualizing my study that would address both theoretical questions of identity formation and literary history, and empirical questions of contract negotiations and box office revenues. It has enabled me to understand how theoretical inquiry and empirical research mutually inflect and inform one another in often unpredictable ways. It has provided me with a way of understanding the theoretical implications of the questions I have asked about Trilby's popularity, and of understanding these questions in relation to longer disciplinary histories and debates.

The feminist collective of which I am a member coalesced around a course on feminist materialism in the fall of 1996, the very course in which I first explored Trilby's publication history. Two emphases of our collective work have been crucial to the methodology and theoretical framework of this study: our definition of feminist materialism as a methodology that explains the ongoing production and reproduction of gender as a social category in uneven and unpredictable ways, and our attention to the

discourse of professionalization as it is currently configured in Humanities graduate programs.

Gender as a category of analysis is clearly central to my chapters on the status and representation of the artist's model at the *fin de siècle*, and on the value and function of hypnotism, concerns over which practice focused on the vulnerability, both psychological and sexual, of female subjects to male hypnotists. Women's bodies are less in evidence in the first chapter on debates about romance and realism, and in the final chapter on Herbert Beerbohm Tree's performance of Svengali. What, then, is my claim to feminist materialism as an important methodology for my conceptualization of this project? For it is our collaborative work on feminist materialism that has enabled me to conceive of this project as one for which gender *is* a crucial category of analysis.

As I argue in Chapter One, it is precisely the perceived feminization and commodification of the emergent institution of English literary studies that is at stake in the controversy which coalesces around the University of Oxford's appointment of its first Chair of English. This controversy has a longer history in the debates over the respective value of romance and realism as divergent grounds for a healthy national English literature in the 1870s and 1880s. Trilby's conscription to these debates by both romancers and realists interests me because it bespeaks the continuing purchase of the popular at a historical moment when the "great divide" between high and popular culture was becoming increasingly entrenched. Although, as many literary critics have argued, the late-Victorian period was marked by the transgression or dissolution of boundaries—of sex, race, and class—the boundary between high culture and popular culture was confirmed and entrenched in this period.

In Chapter Four I analyse Herbert Beerbohm Tree's role as a prominent late-Victorian actor-manager, arguing that Tree's adaptation of Trilby in part subsidized his continuing forays into the new drama. Tree occupied an ambivalent role for theatre critics because he professed commitment to the new drama and disinterest in the financial aspects of his company even as his production rosters indicated his awareness, as a manager, of his company's bottom line. Contrary to biographers who have insisted on Tree's insensibility to business matters, I suggest that Tree struck a public posture of indifference to his company's finances in order to accrue cultural capital as an artist rather than as a mere manager. This ostensible indifference to business affairs is belied not only by Tree's adaptation of Trilby, for which production he drew on available popular stereotypes of Jewish identity for his portrayal of Svengali; it is also belied by his careful attention to his selection of leading actresses, whether Mrs. Patrick Campbell in a new drama like The Second Mrs. Tanqueray or Dorothea Baird, a relatively unknown actress "discovered" by Tree to play opposite him in the popular Trilby.

In my analysis of Trilby's production and reception in four different contexts, I have drawn on feminist and materialist methodologies in order to explain the participation of Trilby in the debates I have mapped out. My goal is not to provide yet another unexamined context to illuminate our reading of the novel, a goal we might understand as traditionally historicist. Instead I want to analyse the cultural work the novel and its adaptations performed in the debates I have described, a goal I understand as materialist. I am not the only scholar of Trilby to claim materialism as a useful methodology. However, this term has often denoted an attention to the material history of

book publication rather than an attention to the cultural debates in which Trilby participated.

One characteristic of recent work on Trilby is its tendency to focus on either the material conditions of the initial serial's production or the content of the novel itself as the reason for the novel's popularity. Edward L. Purcell's 1977 article on Trilby in relation to the American bestseller system is one of the early and only attempts to situate the novel in relation to modes of literary production. With the exception of Emily Jenkins's impressive article in Book History (1998), which positions Trilby in relation to the market in late-Victorian illustrated book production, subsequent scholarship tends to reiterate Purcell's findings if it gestures at all toward conditions of production. In the latter vein, Jonathan Grossman's "The Mythic Svengali: Anti-Aestheticism in Trilby" (1996) examines the novel as Du Maurier's damning response to the aesthetic movement. Grossman identifies Svengali—rather speciously, it seems to me—as an embodiment of Oscar Wilde, whom Du Maurier had been more explicitly mocking in his cartoons of Postlewaite, the aesthete, in his 1880-82 series for Punch. In Woman and the Demon (1982), Nina Auerbach reads Trilby herself as an embodiment of the femme fatale, described also by Bram Dijkstra in Idols of Perversity (1986), whose excess transgresses late-Victorian constructions of the domesticated woman. Most studies of Trilby thereby remain strictly limited to the novel, and gesture to other cultural reproductions as mere responses to the intrinsic interest the novel provides. My attention to these other cultural reproductions aims to contribute to accounts of commodity culture, such as Jonathan Freedman's Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture (1990) and Thomas Richards's recent study of Victorian commodity culture, by

inserting Trilby into a genealogy that, as my invocation of Freedman and Richards suggests, often overlooks the shift from high-Victorian commodification (Richards cites the 1851 Great Exhibition as the exemplary moment) to modernist disavowals of cultural commodification.

Not only does Trilby figure importantly in the stories of Victorian commodity culture and late-Victorian literary history, which has only recently begun to recognize the permeable and mutually constitutive relationship between "high" and "popular" literary forms; the stories of Trilby's production and reception, I argue, *figure* this mutually constitutive relationship. The four stories I tell here—about representations of romance, of artists and artists' models, of hypnotism, and of Jews on the stage—reveal how particular cultural forms, structures, and institutions derive their authority from the exclusion of figures, genres, and practices tainted by association with the "popular." Thus it is that romance writers are overlooked when the University of Oxford seeks its first Chair of English and romance ultimately cedes to the aesthetic hegemony of realism in post-Victorian literary histories of the late-Victorian period; the model is erased from the scene of high art; hypnotism is disavowed by the medical profession; and the actor-manager's recourse to "the Jew" of melodrama as a stock figure is displaced by new forms of theatrical production.

---

[1] This collection, Trilby and Other Plays, is edited by theatre scholar George Taylor. The version of Potter's play included in the volume is based on Herbert Beerbohm Tree's prompt copy housed in the Herbert Beerbohm Tree collection at the University of Bristol.

[2] Penguin Classics published its recent edition of the novel in 1994. Edited by Daniel Pick, the text is based on the three-volume Osgood, McIlvaine and Company edition of 1894 which did not include Du Maurier's illustrations,

illustrations which were included in both the Harper's New Monthly Magazine serial publication and the subsequent single-volume editions. Despite the shortcoming of its lack of illustrations, this edition is carefully presented. At thirty-three pages, Pick's introduction is a fine overview of the book's original publication, including a discussion of the Whistler-Du Maurier libel affair, information about Du Maurier's relationship with Henry James, and references to the ways in which the novel was popularized in 1895. Pick includes approximately five pages of notes, with helpful references to other sources and interesting information about changes in the publishing industry in the mid-1890s. His two pages of suggestions for further reading, used in tandem with the references to other sources cited in his notes, offer a broad base from which to begin researching both the publishing history of the book and themes represented in the book, such as mesmerism, bohemianism, and constructions of "race" in the 1890s. He also provides a helpful appendix, including background information on Whistler's libel suit and "Joe Sibley" quotations from the original text.

Oxford University Press published an edition of Trilby in 1995 in its Oxford Popular Fiction series. Elaine Showalter introduces the text and notes, "this edition is designed to put the novel back into its cultural contexts for a new generation. While there is still no definitive scholarly text of the novel, this edition combines the most complete English text with Du Maurier's most significant illustrations" (xi). Unfortunately the introduction indicates neither which edition it is using as a source nor the criteria used to determine which illustrations are, in fact, the "most significant." Whereas Pick includes five pages of notes to the actual text of Trilby (in addition to the five pages of notes to his introduction), Showalter includes no notes on the text of the novel. She does, however, include some important information for Du Maurier scholars both in her informative introduction (which includes more material on the stage adaptations and general popularity of Trilby than does Pick's introduction) and in her brief bibliography, which includes mention of the Beerbohm Tree archive at the Bristol University Theatre Collection and references to contemporary reviews of the novel. The paucity of notes in this edition is rectified in the 1998 Oxford World's Classics edition of the novel, which includes not only the same Showalter introduction as the 1995 Oxford Popular Fiction edition but also thirty-seven pages of thorough notes on the text by Dennis Denisoff.

Leonée Ormond's 1994 Everyman edition for J.M. Dent is as close to a definitive edition as we currently have in print. Ormond's edition is based on the 1894 Harper's illustrated book edition, and includes the illustrations from that edition. In addition to a brief but useful introduction, Ormond includes two chronologies (one of Du Maurier's life and one of his times), a list of illustrations, passages from the novel originally published in serial format but excised from the book editions, a sample of contemporary reviews, suggestions for further reading, a text summary, and fifty-three pages of notes, including translations from the French.

[3] This is an adapted version of the definition of historical materialism provided in the introduction to (The) Concrete Matters: Locating Feminist Materialism in Theory and Practice: "Materialism provides a means of historicizing cultural practices relative to social relations of power" (1).

Chapter One
The Critical Project of Romance:
George Du Maurier, Andrew Lang, and the Institution of English Literature

In January 1894, Harper's New Monthly Magazine included the first instalment of George Du Maurier's Trilby. The novel, illustrated by the author, was an immediate success with readers. Harper's enjoyed a circulation increase early in the novel's serialization, and when the Bookman printed its first bestseller list almost a year later, Trilby was on it. Trilby mania had hit, at least in the United States. Parodies were published, tie-in merchandise was flogged, and stage adaptations toured the U.S. and Canada. In Great Britain, critics commented on this frenzy with amusement. "Whether the English public is to be visited with an attack of the mental disorder called 'Trilbyania' yet remains to be seen," lamented one reviewer. By the autumn of 1895, however, the frenzy had emigrated. Ernest Dowson, living in France, heard from a correspondent "that there is a 'Trilby boom' in London now—everything, hats, collars, coats & mantles à la Trilby. It is also on at the theatre quelque part" (University of Victoria, Dowson Fonds). British readers flocked to booksellers, and audiences flocked to London's Haymarket Theatre, where actor-manager Herbert Beerbohm Tree's stage production attracted capacity crowds. By 1900, the vogue for Trilby had passed. The Trilby hat, a sort of fedora worn by the hero, seemed to be the novel's only legacy—along, perhaps, with the term Svengali to denote a villain who exerts the power to control and transform his female victims.

How did George Du Maurier's famously popular second novel achieve its popularity in print? How did contemporary critics and readers respond to the novel? And how did the novel participate in broader debates about the status of English literature at a

moment of marked anxiety about the future direction and function of this literature? In this chapter I consider both Trilby's production by George Du Maurier and the Harper publishing firm, and its reception among readers and critics. I address initially the question of Trilby's popularity in print form because I want to concentrate on the novel's popularity prior to the touring stage adaptations and merchandising that further manifested this popularity in 1895 and beyond. Critics like Nina Auerbach, Mary Russo, and Elaine Showalter have addressed the question of Trilby's popularity by exploring the novel's content. In the first section of this chapter I want instead to emphasize the venue of Trilby's publication as a crucial, but often overlooked, context for the production of Trilby's popularity. Trilby was first published serially in Harper's New Monthly Magazine, an American family magazine which boasted a substantial British audience, and subsequently by the Harper publishing company (and their British representatives, Osgood, McIlvaine) in various book forms. In my analysis of the novel's initial serialization and book publication, I explore not only the status of Harper's as a widely-read, quality, middle-class family magazine, but also the role of "the house of Harper" in promoting the novel across the range of its publications.

After situating the novel in relation to these material conditions of publication, I go on to emphasize yet another important condition of publication: late-Victorian debates about the "art of fiction" and the relative merits of romance versus realism as two opposing aesthetic modes of late-Victorian literary production. Reviews of the novel and its subsequent stage adaptations suggest that reviewers were divided on the question of Trilby's genre. Had Du Maurier penned a romance, an adventure about the "three musketeers of the brush," that shared common ground with then-popular novels by

Stevenson and Haggard? Or had he depicted with a realist's accuracy the artistic trials and tribulations of apprentice artists in Paris in the late 1850s? I address this question of Trilby's generic indeterminacy by locating the novel at the crux of these late-Victorian debates about romance and realism. I trace these debates on genre in the mainstream press from the late 1870s through the 1890s, arguing that this critical controversy over the "art of fiction" and the role of romance is central not only to Trilby's reception, but also to our current understanding of the emergence and institutionalization of English Literature as a discipline.

In my early research on Trilby's serial publication in Harper's New Monthly Magazine, I was interested to discover Andrew Lang's role as a paid English reader for Harpers in the late 1880s as the company sought to augment its stable of English writers. The foremost advocate of romance in the 1880s, Lang is now a spectral figure in English studies, perhaps most recognized in the field of children's literature for his Colour Fairy Books. In the mid-1880s, however, he was a lively participant in debates about both romance and the emergence of English Literature as an academic discipline. Although Lang was no longer a reader for Harpers at the moment when Du Maurier's manuscript of Trilby was acquired for publication, his earlier role in shaping the magazine's fiction content bears on debates about the generic status of the novel because he was such an outspoken proponent of romance throughout the 1880s and 1890s. The analysis of Andrew Lang's failed academic career, with which I conclude this chapter, elaborates how literary critics were frequently marginalized in relation to the emergent discipline of English Literature at English universities. Ostensibly leisured "men of letters," late-Victorian literary critics were in fact implicated in the literary marketplace in a way that

the founders of English as a discipline, at Oxford at least, found distasteful. That the professionalization of English Literature at Oxford was predicated on the repudiation of such investment in the literary marketplace has often been overlooked in histories of the emergence of English as a discipline.

Similarly, the narrative of professionalization that Du Maurier charts in Trilby has been overlooked in literary criticism of the novel. I suggest that we can read Du Maurier's narrative of Little Billee's, Sandy's, and Taffy's professionalization as artists as an implicit occlusion of the artistic marketplace's role in consolidating their identities as successful artists. The novel manifests a distinct nostalgia for the past moment of the artists' apprenticeships, representing the older artists as critically and financially successful, yet attributing this success to their artistic development and inherent genius. We could read this celebration of the artists' Bohemian pasts over their conventional professional identities as a prefiguration of Du Maurier's own ambivalence about the fame he would achieve with Trilby. I want instead to suggest that Du Maurier's depiction participates more broadly in late-Victorian debates about the status of the professional—whether artist, critic, or writer—and the necessary repudiation of the marketplace that consolidates this professional identity. It is the status of the professional artist, in particular, that will be the focus of my next chapter.

Harper and the Machinery of Popular Fiction

The practice of "puffing," or the advertisement of books by means of flamboyantly enthusiastic reviews, was nothing new in the 1890s when Du Maurier came to publish his second novel in Harper's. Puffery had been much practised and derided throughout the nineteenth century. By the 1880s, the taint of "log-rolling," as "puffing" became known,

was sufficient to make literary critics balk at the accusation. Thus it was that Andrew Lang strove to defend himself against cries of log-rolling in his column of *causeries* published in Longman's Magazine. Literary critics were to remain aloof from the temptations of either venality or the promotion of their friends, at least in theory. This ostensible cultivation of an Arnoldian disinterestedness was what invested them, in part, with the authority to undertake their literary evaluations. As writers and, increasingly, readers well knew, such disinterestedness was a noble aspiration, but was difficult to achieve in practice. What was more, as George Gissing famously, if depressingly, pointed out in New Grub Street (1891), the Jasper Milvains of the late-Victorian literary world were getting ahead not because of their scholarly assiduity or careful prose stylings, but because of their connections in the rapidly expanding literary marketplace. But even these hard-won connections appeared paltry in comparison to the connections provided by the engines of some late-Victorian publishers. Publishing firms like Harper—which proliferated their publication venues across a range of weekly and monthly magazines geared to specific audiences, as well as their business in the book trade—had built into the very structure of their business organization a network of editors, publications, and writers to facilitate the promotion of Harper's material.

The publishing house of Harper and Brothers, established in 1817, played an important role in the dissemination of British authors to the American reading public throughout the Victorian period. Firm biographer Eugene Exman recounts how Harper built up a stable of English authors before 1850, when the firm diversified its interests and took on the competing weeklies by founding the first of its successful magazine publications. The 1835 contract between Harper and silver-fork novelist Bulwer-Lytton,

ensuring Bulwer-Lytton £150 for proofs of his new novels, "is one of the earliest—perhaps the first—known contract between an American publisher and his English author" (Exman 54). Other important English authors published by Harper before mid-century included the Brontë sisters and Thackeray. "For the publishing firm of Harpers & Bros.," comments Laurel Brake, "the 'transatlantic connection' was first and last economic and commercial" (Brake 104).

Prior to the advent of the Chace Law on international copyright in 1891, which made impossible the previous practice of publishing English material in the U.S. without paying royalties, the publication of English fiction in the U.S. was highly profitable. Harper conjoined this profitability of English fiction and the proliferation of magazine publication venues in a strategy to combat the successful competing weeklies by serializing English fiction in new Harper's magazines. Harper's New Monthly Magazine was the first of a retinue of Harper's publications that would, by the end of the century, work together to promote the popular English fiction published by Harper's in serial and book formats.

Even the Harper brothers themselves underestimated the enthusiasm which greeted the publication of English authors in the New Monthly Magazine. 7,500 copies of Volume I, Number I (June 1850) were printed; by December, the demand per number had increased to 50,000. This popularity was due to three reasons: the greater amount of reading material provided by the Magazine (144 two-column pages); the lower price (25¢ a copy); and the caliber and popularity of English contributions (which included Dickens's Bleak House, Thackeray's The Newcomes, and Eliot's Romola).[1] Another important component of the Magazine was illustration. The Magazine's first number in

1850 included three portrait engravings, but the number of illustrations (and the amount of money spent on illustrations) increased along with the Magazine's circulation. In 1865, the then-editor estimated that the Magazine had printed 10,000 engravings at a cost of $300,000, including original drawings. This emphasis on illustration was one pet project of Fletcher Harper, who continued to oversee the Magazine's content in his role as publisher. Fletcher insisted to editors that "the guiding editorial principle was to publish what would be intelligible, interesting, and useful to the average American" (Exman 77). According to one publisher's reader, Harper "made few mistakes about his public because he created it" (Exman 77).

Even after Fletcher Harper's death, Harper's New Monthly Magazine continued to cultivate established English writers and, increasingly, to promote the publication of American writers. Competition for contributors increased with the advent of competing monthly magazines, namely the Atlantic Monthly (1857-) and Scribner's (1870, renamed the Century after 1881); these three magazines, as "the three leading quality [American] magazines" (Exman 79), vied for readership. One strategy adopted by Harper and Brothers to promote their imprint among readers was the proliferation of magazines across a range of readerships. Indeed, as Fletcher Harper insisted, "periodicals were a tender to the book business of the House" (Exman 122). Harper's Weekly, for example, was born as a family newspaper that "would give sound views on political, social, and moral questions; carry articles on travel, adventure, art, and literature; [and] present well-edited news, both foreign and domestic" (Exman 80). But because "there was more available fiction than the Magazine could use" (Exman 80), the Weekly also published fiction that could not be fit into the Magazine. And, as I will show, the Weekly promoted

fiction that was published in the Magazine and in book form by Harpers. House of Harper biographer Eugene Exman ascribes the success of the Weekly to its combination of fine illustration and editorial acumen; it was, he insists, "the best illustrated and edited news weekly to be had" (Exman 92). The Magazine and the Weekly were supplemented in November 1867 by Harper's Bazar. Like Harpers' other publications, it boasted "brilliant illustrations, [and] clever text" (Exman 121), but it used these advantages in the field of fashion. Although the Bazar included articles, stories, and poems, its primary feature was the fashion plate, as its subtitle indicated: "A Repository of Fashion, Pleasure and Instruction" (qtd. in Exman 123). By 1880, Harper's Bazar "had a circulation of 150,000 and boasted a readership of half a million" (Exman 122); "the Boston Transcript said that to dress by it would be the aim and ambition of the women of America" (Exman 122). And by 1885, the Magazine, in which Trilby eventually appeared, had a circulation of about 200,000 in the U.S. and 35,000 in Great Britain—"the widest readership of any magazine of its kind, partly because of its informative articles on world concerns" (Exman 79).

Despite the negative connotations of puffing for literary critics who valued their reputations for intellectual independence, Harpers' publishing machinery ensured that the success of Trilby was broadcast across the range of publications associated with its imprint. In September 1894, the very month that Harper and Brothers issued the first book edition of the novel, Margaret Sangster published a review of it in Harper's Weekly, lauding Du Maurier's powers of representation and praising his realistic depiction of Bohemian Paris in the 1850s. The magazine continued to remind readers of Trilby's popularity even after the serialized version had concluded: in January 1895, a ballad on

Trilby by John Kendrick Bangs appeared; in March 1895, Barnet Phillips published an article on Du Maurier's illustrations for the novel; and in April 1895, Potter's stage adaptation was the subject of scrutiny. Harper's Bazar also drew on and contributed to the novel's popularity, publishing lyrics and music from Trilby, including Ben Bolt (Gilder 30).

George Du Maurier, Nineteenth-Century Illustration, and Social Realism

After George Du Maurier died on 6 October 1896, it was primarily as an illustrator, or an "artist in black and white" (Ainger, "Du Maurier" 586) as his friend Alfred Ainger later put it in the Dictionary of National Biography, that he was eulogized.[2] Henry James recalled "his forty years of pictorial work" ("George Du Maurier" 595) and Ainger fondly remembered his commitment to "continuously improving in his art" ("George Du Maurier in Hampstead" 12). Harper's New Monthly Magazine posthumously published a two-part essay on "Social Pictorial Satire" by Du Maurier in 1898, in which he proposed "to speak of the craft to which I have devoted the best years of my life, the craft of portraying, by means of little pen and ink strokes, lines and scratches, a small portion of the world in which we live" (Du Maurier, "Social Pictorial Satire. I" 331). And Lewis Lusk in the Art Journal remarked, "Du Maurier is not a painter, but his art is scholarly and contains some of the scholarly qualities of paint." "Always caring very much for style," Lusk continued, "he has rendered the most commonplace objects in a way which gives them charm and dignity, even the trouser and skirt of the early Victorian period, even such things as coal scuttles" (Lusk 339).

That Du Maurier is best remembered for his illustrations for Punch and the phenomenal success that was Trilby is born out by subsequent scholarship and

memorials. In a 7 March 1934 "Centenary Number" devoted to Du Maurier, Punch reprinted a generous selection of his cartoons from that magazine along with "Some Personal Recollections of Du Maurier." In the same year, the Cornhill Magazine published "George Du Maurier at Thirty-Three," a reminiscence by E.V. Lucas consisting of Lucas's diary entries for 1867 and 1868. In a preface to Lucas's entries, the Cornhill editors described Du Maurier as "one of the mainstays of the national humorous paper [Punch] and the most vigilant critic of the modes and manners of his adopted land." They also claimed Du Maurier for themselves: "Du Maurier was one of the 'Cornhill's' most constant and valued artists" (Lucas 385).

Despite such posthumous adulation, Du Maurier's career had been slow to begin because his interest in art found little outlet before his father's death in 1856. At his father's behest, the young Du Maurier had undertaken the study of chemistry at the Birkbeck Chemical Laboratory of University College in London. So enthusiastic was he for Du Maurier to pursue a career in science that Du Maurier's father provided him with his own laboratory in Barge Yard, Bucklersbury. "A most unsatisfactory student while at the college" (Ainger, "Du Maurier" 587) by his own account, Du Maurier was already drawing in his spare time, obtaining in 1852 a ticket to draw from sculptures at the British Museum. He abandoned his scientific career immediately upon his father's death, wasting no time in determining to study art abroad; his father died on 8 June 1856 and Du Maurier departed for France that same summer. In Paris, he registered at the studio of Charles Gleyre, a disciple of Ingres and later tutor to such students as Monet and Renoir in the 1860s. Despite the creative ferment of Gleyre's studio, Du Maurier remained indifferent "to avant-garde experiments in French painting" (Ormond, George Du

Maurier 46). After a year in Paris, Du Maurier decamped to Antwerp, where he studied under historical painter Nicaise de Keyser at the Antwerp Academy of Fine Arts, then regarded as one of the leading European art schools. 1857 was a defining year for Du Maurier's art career because it was during that year that he lost the sight in his left eye, a condition that was never cured.

Biographer Leonée Ormond speculates that Du Maurier suffered from a detached retina. Whatever the cause, his temporary blindness led to a peripatetic existence of several years' duration, during which he sought a cure from oculists in Belgium and Germany, and ultimately to his career in black-and-white illustration rather than large-scale art. In May 1860, Du Maurier departed Dusseldorf for London, where he hoped to earn enough money as an illustrator to dig himself out of debt accrued from eye treatments. By the autumn of 1860, Du Maurier's work was appearing regularly in the "profusely illustrated" (Ormond, George Du Maurier 109) Once A Week, and Punch editor Mark Lemon had accepted several initial letters for that magazine.[3] These somewhat modest commissions of illustrated initial letters, which paid fifteen shillings each, marked the beginning of Du Maurier's long career as an illustrator for Punch.

First issued on 17 July 1841, Punch; or, The London Charivari (1841-1992, 1996-) was the brainchild of "engraver, draughtsman, and newspaper projector" (Spielmann 15) Ebenezer Landells and author (and later social investigator) Henry Mayhew. Modelled on the Paris Charivari, which featured "one large cut and three pages of satirical text" (Altick, Punch 6), Punch was a threepenny weekly "illustrated journal of life and manners of the day" (Spielmann 16). As its prospectus described, it was to be "a new work of wit and whim, embellished with cuts and caricatures" (qtd. in Spielmann

23). From its inception, illustration played a key role in the magazine's conception and in its popularity. After Mayhew and Landells recruited Mark Lemon and Stirling Coyne to co-edit the magazine with Mayhew, they appointed a literary staff, three artists-in-ordinary, and a cartoonist. Initial reviews of the magazine were encouraging and singled out its illustrations for praise. The Morning Advertiser remarked on Punch's "exquisite woodcuts, serious and comic. . . executed in the first style of art, at a price so low that we really blush to name it" (qtd. in Spielmann 30).

Scholars of Punch such as Richard Altick and Marion Henry Spielmann have examined in close detail the production and reception of the magazine in its first decade and throughout the nineteenth century, respectively. My concern here is to explore briefly the conditions which made possible Punch's emergence and increasing predominance as a successful illustrated magazine. Drawing on the work of Altick and Spielmann as well as historians of the book and of illustration in the nineteenth century, I want to contextualize Du Maurier's early career as an illustrator for Punch, and to argue that Du Maurier's illustration work, which culminated in the illustrations for his own novels in the 1890s, participated in a tradition of social realism. This mode of social realism found its clearest expression in Du Maurier's satirical series on aesthetes and aestheticism in Punch in the 1870s and 1880s. But this social realism is, I contend, also the mode of illustration of Trilby. To read the illustrations for Trilby thus may therefore complicate current generic understandings of the novel as a late-Victorian romance and may account, in part, for the novel's reception as a *roman à clef* despite its fantastical elements.

The use of illustrations to satirical effect was nothing new when Punch rose to comic ascendancy at mid-century. William Hogarth's representations of eighteenth-

century life had satirized not just the inhabitants of Gin Lane but also the aristocracy; this was satire with a ferocious bite.[4] And yet Hogarth's series of engravings (The Harlot's Progress, The Rake's Progress, and Marriage à la Mode) were enormously popular at their moment of production. Also popular were political and social satirical prints by artists like Thomas Rowlandson, James Gillray, and Isaac Cruikshank (father of artist George Cruikshank, who went on to illustrate Dickens's Sketches by Boz (1836-37) and Oliver Twist (1837-38)). Although nineteenth-century writers like Dickens admired Hogarth's work for its compassion for the poor and its critique of society, many of Dickens's contemporaries were outraged by "Hogarth's 'indecent' and 'immoral' art" (Ormond, "Hogarth" 274). Punch toed the satirical line without straying into Hogarth's territory. According to one early review of the magazine, this avoidance of so-called vulgarity was what distinguished it. "It is the first comic we ever saw," noted the Somerset County Gazette, "which was not vulgar. It will provoke many a hearty laugh, but never call a blush to the most delicate cheek" (qtd. in Spielmann 30).

Although the use of satirical illustrations was nothing new at mid-century, technological developments in printing enabled the magazine to maximize its print run while simultaneously remaining committed to a high quality in its illustration reproductions. Having survived the pressures of the stamp duty, advertisement duty, and paper duty in the early 1840s, Punch lived on to take advantage of these new reproduction processes as it sought to broaden its readership. Along with recently established magazines like the Illustrated London News, which also, as its name suggests, advertised illustration as a primary feature, Punch offered theatrical reviews, satires, character profiles, essays, editorials, "facetiae" ("small, single-paragraph jokes, some in

verse" (Altick, Punch 2)), and fiction, accompanied by generous illustrations. The nineteenth century ushered in new illustrative techniques, including mezzotint, aquatint, lithography, and engraving on steel. Steel engraving offered an improvement on copper engraving because it was cheaper. "Producing illustrations from engraved copper plates" was costly "because the soft copper quickly wore down and allowed only short print runs"; "Steel," to the contrary, "was much harder than copper and not only made longer print runs possible, but could also be more finely engraved, allowing rich grey and black tones to be created in the illustrations" (Simler 5).

Punch, however, adhered strictly to the technique of wood engraving, despite these innovations. As Spielmann remarked of this decision to retain the use of wood engraving throughout the nineteenth century, "Punch. . . is a Conservative among Conservatives" (250). The magazine nonetheless participated in the revival of wood engraving that began with Thomas Bewick in the late eighteenth century and dominated illustration techniques from 1790 to 1835, according to Geoffrey Wakeman.[5] The primary cartoon was always drawn directly on the wooden block for engraving purposes, and other contributing artists' illustrations were transferred from paper to block and then engraved. Priority was accorded to quality of execution of the wood engravings. "No block was hurried," Spielmann explained. "If it could not be ready for one week, it was held over for the next" (Spielmann 251). This attention to detail was duly noted by admirers of the magazine. As artist William Frith later remarked, "I once saw one of Leech's drawings on the wood, and I afterwards saw it in Punch, and I remember wondering at the fidelity with which it was rendered. Some of the lines, finer than the

finest hair, had been cut away or *thickened*, but the character, the vigour, and the beauty were scarcely damaged" (qtd. in Spielmann 252).

Punch, then, from its early years, manifested a commitment to quality illustrations. If, as the magazine's first official Cartoonist, John Leech, sometimes complained, the illustrations failed to live up to his original drawings, the fault lay less with the engravers than with "the conditions of rapid printing" (Spielmann 252). Du Maurier's cartoons for Punch contributed to the magazine's reputation for quality illustrations. Indeed, Henry James avowed in 1883 Du Maurier's crucial contribution to this reputation: "'Punch, for the last fifteen years, has been, artistically speaking, George Du Maurier" (qtd. in Reid, Illustrators 176). As Forrest Reid points out, Du Maurier's caricatures of aesthetes in the 1870s and 1880s functioned not only as illustrations but as criticism: "from the seventies on, the work of Du Maurier had become more and more a mere comment on fashionable society, and the artist in him had more and more given place to the journalist" (Reid, Illustrators 176). We might read Du Maurier's career as an illustrator in the 1870s and 1880s as a negotiation between the role of the artist, to which he had always aspired, and the role of the social critic, as Reid suggests. Although illustration in the 1870s and 188s walked a fine line between art and "something that is not art" (2), Du Maurier made clear in Trilby the distinction between the artist and the critic, valuing the artist over the critic.

In Part IV of Trilby, Du Maurier's narrator remarks the ascension of Little Billee to the ranks of the Royal Academy. Here, as elsewhere, he lauds Little Billee's genius for art and attests that his resulting fame is warranted by his great talent. For the narrator, one of the signs of the genuineness of Little Billee's talent as an artist is the "opposition and

vilification and coarse abuse of him" by a faction of "philistine" critics (Du Maurier, Trilby 216). This negative criticism serves only to validate Little Billee's talents. The derision of these erstwhile critics is construed by the narrator as a sign of the legitimacy of his artistic gifts and of the staying power of his art. If the philistines abhor it, it must be art.

But Du Maurier's narrator does not easily put aside this allusion to the work of critics. Instead he spins out a vituperative rant against the mediocrity of critics whom he characterizes, in a now hackneyed stereotype, as a band of failed artists:

> And then, when popular acclaim brings the great dealers and the big cheques, up rises the printed howl of the duffer, the disappointed one, the 'wounded thing with an angry cry'—the prosperous and happy bagman that *should* have been, who has given up all for art, and finds he can't paint and make himself a name, after all, and never will, so falls to writing about those who can—and what writing!
>
> To write in hissing dispraise of our more successful fellow-craftsman, and of those who admire him! That is not a clean or pretty trade. It seems, alas! An easy one, and it gives pleasure to so many. It does not even want good grammar. But it pays—well enough even to start and run a magazine with, instead of scholarship and taste and talent! humor, sense, wit and wisdom! It is something like the purveying of pornographic pictures: some of us look at them and laugh, and even buy. To be a purchaser is bad enough; but to be the purveyor thereof—ugh! (Du Maurier, Trilby 217)[6]

This debate about the relationship between art and criticism extended beyond the realm of art and into the realm of literature, where literary critics contested the mutual exclusivity of these categories as set out in Trilby among other texts.

Reading the Romance

In the mid-1880s, debates about the value and influence of realism dominated English literary criticism. Late Victorian romance, realism's "assumed contrary" (Feltes 105) in these debates, was championed by opponents of realism, produced by novelists like Robert Louis Stevenson and Rider Haggard, and enjoyed limited favour before its critical demise in the early 1890s. Although subsequent scholarship tended to naturalize "the inevitable triumph of realism" (Pykett 168), critics like Lyn Pykett and Norman Feltes have more recently interrogated this triumphalist narrative. They argue that debates about realism were not merely about style, but formed part of a continuing contest over the control of literary representation and production.

In his 1928 article, "The English Controversy over Realism in Fiction 1885-1895," William C. Frierson offers an early and nuanced account of the "heated controversy" about "the inclusion of fact, brutal fact, in fiction" (Frierson 533) in the 1890s. In his emphasis on the periodical press as a primary site of debate and his insistence that only "a partial victory had been won for the principle of realism" (Frierson 550) at the *fin de siècle*, Frierson departs from earlier critics, like Holbrook Jackson, who downplayed or ignored "the turbulent clash of ideas which accompanied the transition" (Frierson 533).[7] Frierson recounts how the English press responded to English translations of French naturalists like Zola, Balzac, and the Goncourts, as well as to the increasingly naturalist novels of English writers like George Moore who were heavily

influenced by French naturalism.[8] The dates employed in the title of his article are important because Frierson's aim, in part, is to identify "the successive phases of the transition which was effected" (Frierson 533).

Subsequent critics have been less interested in narrating the story of realism's eventual hegemony than in interrogating our received literary history of the late Victorian period. In "Representing the Real: The English Debate about Naturalism, 1884-1900," Lyn Pykett takes issue with earlier critics like Frierson and Clarence Decker, whose influential PMLA articles were published in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Pykett argues convincingly that Decker's and Frierson's Whiggish accounts of the gradual assimilation of French naturalism by English writers occlude "debates about political representation" (Pykett 169) from their stories of late Victorian aesthetic progress. These debates, contends Pykett, were central not only to the reception of French naturalism but also to "the critical discourse on the novel throughout the nineties" and "the controversies about the New Fiction and the fiction of sex" (Pykett 168). In Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel (1993), Norman Feltes undertakes a symptomatic reading of novels as well as contributions to the 1883-84 "art of fiction" debate by Walter Besant, Henry James, and Robert Louis Stevenson. His analysis aims to show how "such categories as 'realism' and 'romance,' or 'art' and 'popular,' were defined and fixed by . . . material structures of value" (Feltes 64). Ultimately, he argues, these apparently theoretical arguments "show a determinate relationship to the practices of entrepreneurial and list publishers, as well as to these specific ideologies of literary value" (Feltes 64). More recently Nicholas Daly has argued that the revival of romance in the 1880s does not look back to "earlier narrative forms," but instead constitutes "a distinctively *modern*

phenomenon . . . that . . . was shaped in the same historical mould as literary modernism" (Daly 9). Daly's thesis is that popular romance fiction "takes over from the domestic realist novel as the narrative flagship of middle-class Britain" (Daly 4) and itself constitutes "a form of narrative theory of social change" (Daly 5).

My focus in the rest of this chapter differs from these critics in my emphasis on the continuity between debates about the status and function of English literature and debates about the institutionalization of English Literature as a discipline. As Pykett, Feltes, and Daly have all argued, theories of the late-Victorian novel's development have often relied on stylistic rather than materialist analysis. My contribution to these efforts to historicize the shifting modes of late-Victorian literary production is to point out the coincidence of romance's effacement from literary histories of the period and romancers' effacement from the disciplinary history of English Literature. Whereas the effacement of romance from literary histories of the late-Victorian period was a protracted effort by critics like Frierson and Decker over decades of literary criticism, the effacement of romancers from the disciplinary history of English occurred immediately at the moment of English's institutionalization and has remained largely uncovered.

Andrew Lang and the Politics of Romance

During his lifetime, Andrew Lang was renowned as a poet, Greek scholar, folklorist, and prodigious periodical contributor.[9] After his death in 1912, however, he began a posthumous existence as an "elegant hack" (Langstaff 118) with an impoverished sense of literary discrimination. Henry James, for example, refused to exculpate Lang for the crimes of his literary criticism. In a letter to Edmund Gosse, James rebuked Lang for "his *cultivation*, absolutely, of the puerile imagination and the fourth-rate opinion" (qtd.

in Gross 152). Lang's obituary in The Times remarked on his ability to conceal "his astonishing power of work under the air of a dilletante" ("Obituary" 11). And in his 1920 volume, Portraits of the Eighties, Horace Hutchinson fondly remembered Lang as "the last man to whom I would go for a judicious opinion on men, women, or affairs" (Hutchinson 209). Lang continues to fare only mildly better in recent criticism. His latest biographer suggests that he left "to posterity little of enduring value in the realm of literary criticism" (Langstaff 104) and Harold Orel describes his legacy as "a disappointment, and less than it might have been" (Orel 150). My object is not to recuperate Lang as some misbegotten scion of literary criticism. Instead I want to explore Lang's role in debates about both romance and the emergence of English Literature as an academic discipline—roles which have been occluded by this emphasis on the literary merit of his criticism.

In this section, I begin by examining the defence of romance as one moment in the contest over the control of literary production and representation. I focus specifically on debates preceding the apparent breakdown of romance and the successful institutionalization of English literature in the 1890s in order to respond to the following questions: What was at stake in the defence of romance as a category of criticism, on one hand, and the defence of literature as a direction for English studies, on the other? And what are the legacies of these projects for our own critical and disciplinary constructions of English literary studies?

The details of Lang's involvement in the institutionalization of English have remained unexplored. Disciplinary histories, like Chris Baldick's important book The Social Mission of English Criticism, emphasize Matthew Arnold's role as the progenitor

of English studies and exclude Lang from their narratives; biographical resources concentrate on Lang's literary and anthropological contributions. I want here to excavate Lang's own writings about romance and to shed some light on Lang's role in the institutionalization of English Literature at Oxford University in the mid-1880s when the Merton Professorship of English Language and Literature was inaugurated. First, I situate Lang in relation to contemporary debates on romance and realism. I focus on his monthly periodical contributions to Longman's Magazine, in which he argued that romance was a means of reinvigorating an increasingly decadent English fiction. I then explore Lang's relationship to Oxford University and the emerging discipline of English Language and Literature. I cannot claim definitively—despite indications in several secondary sources, including the Dictionary of National Biography—that Lang was encouraged to stand for the Chair or that Arnold encouraged him to stand for the Professorship of Poetry on several occasions. In the absence of definitive proof of such seeming institutional sanction, I draw on the work of Baldick, Franklin Court, John Gross, and especially D.J. Palmer's account of the rise of English studies at Oxford in order to theorize the critical inattention to Lang in the context of debates about the role of literary criticism in the emerging discipline of English. I am interested in exploring how the breakdown of romance and Lang's ambivalent relationship to the institution might complicate our literary history of the late-Victorian period and the disciplinary history of English studies.

Recent scholarship on the disciplinary development of English studies has demonstrated how the institutionalization of English beyond the educational centres of Oxford and Cambridge played a key role in the projects of imperial management abroad and domestic educational reform. Yet, as I have already suggested, Matthew Arnold has

nonetheless received the lion's share of critical attention in studies of the development of English studies. As Alan Bacon points out in his study of English Literature at King's College, London, "There is a common tendency to suppose that any history of the teaching of English literature must begin with Matthew Arnold" (Bacon 591). Bacon carefully traces the work of F.D. Maurice in introducing the subject of English Literature at King's College between 1840 and 1853; Bacon's project is an explicit corrective to those histories that begin, erroneously, with Arnold's later contribution to the institutional history of English. Bacon's emphasis, like that of other historians of English studies, is on the history of the particular institution he is studying (in this case, King's College), the contest between Classics and English, the program of study students would follow, and the perception (in this case, that of F.D. Maurice) of the intimate connection between English literature and history—subjects bound by the "wish to cultivate a national spirit" (Bacon 608). Bacon's analysis demonstrates how this "consciousness of nationality" (Bacon 608) as an impetus for and defence of English literature as a legitimate subject preceded Arnold's later advocacy of English studies by at least two decades.[10]

Lang was an Oxford alumnus when his professional career as a literary critic got underway in the 1870s. He had begun his studies at Balliol in 1864 when Benjamin Jowett was senior tutor and Arnold was Professor of Poetry. Although he admired Arnold's verse, Lang never attended Arnold's lectures; he was apparently preoccupied with punting and cricket. From 1868 to 1874 he enjoyed a fellowship at Merton College, leaving for London after he married to pursue a career in journalism. Critics tend to divide Lang's subsequent authorial interests into two discrete categories: poetry and literary criticism, on the one hand, and classics and anthropology, on the other.

Biographer Roger Green's chapter titles suggest the distinction: "the divine amateur" (Green 53) describes Lang's career as a poet and critic, and "mythologist and classical scholar" (Green 68) recounts his contributions to the fields of Greek translation and anthropology. In the annals of literary history, Lang's critical and poetic contributions are described as, at best, witty and literate; often they are considered amateurish trifles. By contrast, his translations of Homer and his critique of anthropologist Max Müller's theory of the genealogy of folktales rank as important work. In these accounts, Lang emerges as an intellectual who lived largely in his head rather than in the world. Although his output varies in intellectual achievement, they suggest, the common thread is his commitment to popular literary criticism rather than the material economy of Grub Street. Horace Hutchinson reminisced about Lang's lack of interest in politics or finances: "But money, and what most men regard as the good things of this life, interested him hardly at all. Folk-lore, crystal gazing, psychical research, and old story of all kinds were the things of the spirit which really seemed to him to matter" (Hutchinson 215). An analysis of Lang's central role in debates about romance in the 1880s and 90s suggests, however, that he was more conscious about the material conditions under which he wrote than such assessments allow. The debates about romance, in fact, hinged on questions of audience and circulation—questions, in short, about the changing literary marketplace.

The primary venue for Lang's promotion of romance was Longman's Magazine, to which he contributed a weekly column entitled "At the Sign of the Ship" from 1886 to 1905. Lang's affiliation with the house of Longman began at Oxford, where he met the son of one of the firm's partners. He published his first book of poetry with Longman and became the firm's chief literary advisor, contributing also to Fraser's Magazine,

Longman's periodical since the early 1860s. When Fraser's went under in 1881, the firm launched its new venture, Longman's Magazine, as a sixpence monthly offering high quality literature to an enlarged and newly literate readership and underselling the competing monthlies which cost a shilling. As Oscar Maurer has pointed out, the magazine's promise soon faded when it could not compete with the cheap illustrated monthlies.[11] But for a time, Lang's column enjoyed wide popularity with the magazine's middle-class readers and respect from publishers, since Lang's recommendations could boost book sales substantially (Reid 502-04, Demoor 87, 90-92).

In a prospectus for the new magazine, editor C.J. Longman indicated that its articles would set aside politics and religion in favour of social and natural history, sports, and "literature of a high standard" (Primeau 209). Remarking on the difference between popular writing and "cultured" literature, Lang described the latter as "a manner of writing so refined and tormented that very few people want to read it" ("Sign," Oct. 1887: 659). For Lang, romance constituted "literature of a high standard." Lang's advocacy of the romance genre preceded the appearance of his column. At his recommendation, Robert Louis Stevenson's "A Gossip on Romance" had appeared in the November 1882 issue of Longman's. The article set forth the tenets of romance which Lang would also champion: the importance of action over character, the body over the conscience, and the role of nature as a site for adventure. As Lang put it in Longman's, "for the men who are the masters of English fiction," "characters and incident are their materials, not character as dominated by the passion of love" ("Sign," Feb. 1891: 454).

But Lang's comments on romance were not limited to the formal. They were also imbricated with his frequent invocations of the literary marketplace. I want to mention

briefly three concerns to which he repeatedly returned throughout the period 1886-1894: the question of international copyright, the deleterious effects of foreign influences, namely naturalism, and the implications of readership for literary production. Lang's discussions of international copyright foregrounded the problem of the American piracy of English texts, a problem which he explicitly figured as driven by consumerism. In the end, the American novelist was no less a loser than his English counterpart since cheap editions of English novels in the U.S. threatened the sales of American novels.[12] The problem of the market was also at the forefront of his concerns about the unfortunate state of English fiction and criticism. "It is not the scribblers only who are to blame," he explained. "If there were no market for such silly wares, they would not be produced" ("Sign," Nov. 1889: 107). At this moment, in 1889, Lang was talking about the New Journalism. But elsewhere he was preoccupied with the amount of trash that English novelists were cranking out to meet the market demand. He hoped to publicize the fact that "the literary profession is the least lucrative of all" ("Sign," Aug. 1890: 460) in order to dissuade more writers of dubious talents from further inundating the market. And finally, Lang, like the National Vigilance Association, expressed reservations about the "pernicious influence" (Becker 350-52) of French naturalist novels, and particularly Zola. His emphasis, however, was often the pecuniary advantage of French novelists over English ones who were restricted by the tyranny of the circulating libraries.[13]

At the same time that realism's scientific procedure was under siege in the periodical press, the science of *language* and its relation to the discipline of English was the subject of hot debate. In the aftermath of two Royal Commissions to investigate the systems of education at Oxford and Cambridge, the establishment of English as a

separate school became increasingly pressing. Even from these early glimmerings, though, the study of English literature met with hostility. When the idea that a Professor of English Literature be attached to the School of Modern History in 1877, the Regius Professor balked at the suggestion of hampering the school "with dilettante teaching" (qtd. in Palmer, 71). The incipient discipline was the object of discussions about *how* it would be taught, if it could be taught at all, and who was best qualified to do so.

The call for candidates for the Merton Professorship of English Language and Literature appeared in The Times in March 1885. The job description stipulated that the Professor "shall lecture and give instruction on the history and criticism of the English language and literature, and on the works of approved English authors" ("University Intelligence," 11). Several prominent literary critics, including George Saintsbury and Edmund Gosse, allowed their names to stand, but A.S. Napier, a well-known philologist trained in Germany, was appointed to the position. His appointment became the occasion for a lengthy campaign by John Churton Collins, yet another failed candidate, aimed at rescuing literature from the hegemony of philology. A Balliol man himself, like Lang, Churton Collins drew inspiration from Arnold's concept of "culture" and from Jowett's teaching to champion the institutionalization of English Literature in conjunction with classical studies rather than philology. Oxford was not his only foe in this fight, although he roundly criticized the electors of Napier in a series of articles for the Pall Mall Gazette. Edmund Gosse also fell victim to his tirades. In a Quarterly Review article, Churton Collins accused Gosse of belonging to the "Dilettanti School" (qtd. in Palmer, 88) of criticism, evidenced by his literary style and blatant inaccuracies. (Gosse had suggested, for example, that Sidney's Arcadia was written in verse.) Finally, Churton

Collins recruited prominent figures, including Arnold and Jowett, to respond to questions about the desirability of English literature instruction in universities, the distinction to be made between philology and literature, and the relationship between English and Classics. The answers were published in the Pall Mall Gazette and Quarterly Review in late 1886 and early 1887 and armed Churton Collins with considerable weaponry in his battle for the establishment of a School of English Literature. Huxley, for example, lamented students' lack of knowledge about "the noble literature which has grown up in these islands during the last three centuries" (qtd. in Palmer, 91). Perhaps surprisingly, Arnold advocated not a *separate* school for the study of English, but the amalgamation of Classics and English Literature. Buoyed by the support of such heavyweights as "the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, the Bishop of London, Mr. Gladstone, Lord Lytton, Professor Jowett, Matthew Arnold, Professor Huxley, Mr. Froude, Sir Theodore Martin, and many others" in his movement to "place the study of Literature on a proper footing" (Collins vii), Churton Collins articulated his argument at greater length in his 1891 treatise, The Study of English Literature: A Plea for Its Recognition and Organization at the Universities. His campaign contributed to the ultimate establishment of the Oxford School of English Literature in 1894.

What is notable about the campaign is the lack of solidarity among men of letters. Churton Collins, a literary critic by trade, did not hesitate to pillory Gosse, his fellow critic. And he did it in precisely the same language employed by detractors of English, like the Regius Professor of History. Churton Collins sacrificed Gosse in an effort to bolster his own position as *not* a dilettante.

I want to return now to the moment immediately following Napier's appointment as Merton Professor because Churton Collins was not the only one to criticize his selection. In a letter to the Academy, Lang expressed discontent with an institutional system in which those who write "in periodicals understanded of the people" were considered inadequately steeped in what he termed "prehistoric English" ("Merton Professorship" 439). In what is clearly a personal statement, Lang wrote, "A man of real capacity and knowledge, and worthy to be endowed, is sometimes driven into periodical literature just because he is *not* endowed. He must write what people at large can read, or he must starve; and this necessity sadly limits the time and energy he can bestow on unremunerative labours of a more 'solid' and 'serious' description" ("Merton Professorship" 439).

Lang's correspondence in the Pierpont Morgan library indicates that he was encouraged on several occasions to stand for academic lectureships, once in competition with Max Müller, for whom the Chair of Comparative Philology at Oxford had been created in 1868. In an undated letter, he explained his intention to stand for a lectureship at St. Andrews: "Mr Max Müller has had abundant lectureships in Oxford, London, in the Hibbert Chair, at Cambridge, and in Germany. I have never had any such chance at all, nor any leisure for these studies except what I could steal. So I think that if there is any hope of my getting this one opportunity of working steadily at a subject like this, I had better try to obtain it" (Lang Correspondence, Pierpont Morgan Library).

Lang's letters point to the paradox implicit in debates about the direction, and directors, of English literature at Oxford in the late nineteenth century. In discussions about the 1885 Merton Professorship, men who earned their livings by their pens were

written off as literary lightweights and therefore unsuitable candidates. Lang continues to live on in literary history as a bookman, an amateur man of letters. But his columns on romance and his commentaries on the emerging discipline of English expose the ostensible leisure of the professional man of letters as a myth. It would perhaps have been difficult for Oxford at this moment to profess the practice of disinterested cultural and literary criticism while employing literary critics, who everywhere call to mind the marketplace. As Lang remarked, "we critics are only the sandwich-men of literature, and our only professional pleasure is to carry sandwich-boards for the truly great" ("Sign," Apr. 1891: 677). Lang's career in the 1880s and 90s suggests how an analysis of the literary value of his work may be productive, *not* as a measure of his achievement but as a way to chart the shifting locations and meanings of intellectual work in the late nineteenth century.

---

[1] For more on the Magazine's popularity, see Exman, 70-71. On the competition among monthlies in 1893, when McClure's, Cosmopolitan, and Munsey's cut their prices per issue from a quarter to fifteen cents and less, see Ohmann 25.

[2] I have assumed that Alfred Ainger is the author of the DNB entry on Du Maurier because the entry is signed "A.A." and because of Ainger's intimacy with Du Maurier during many years of friendship in Hampstead, where they were neighbours. "A.A." notes as his sources "Information from the family, Mr. Thomas Armstrong, C.B., and other friends; Spielmann's History of Punch; McClure's Mag., April 1895; personal knowledge" (591).

[3] Du Maurier's DNB entry remarks that he also worked for "other miscellaneous publications" during this period. In The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900 (1957), Richard Altick indicates that Du Maurier illustrated the Religious Tract Society's Leisure Hour before going over to Punch full time (361).

[4] Dickens's response to his work suggests that Hogarth's satires of the aristocracy were even more forceful that his satires on the poor. Leonée Ormond remarks Dicken's admiration for Hogarth: "Dickens praised Hogarth for his compassion, believing him to have been too aware of 'the causes of drunkenness among the poor' to draw a 'Drunkard's Progress'" ("Hogarth" 274).

[5] Bewick's famous History of British Birds (1797-1804) is the subject of Jane Eyre's reading in the early chapters of the novel when, as a child, she hides herself away behind the heavy curtains to escape the torment of her cousin.

[6] All citations of Trilby refer to the Everyman edition, edited by Leonée Ormond, unless otherwise indicated.

[7] Despite Frierson's legitimate critique, Holbrook Jackson's The Eighteen Nineties (1913) remains an important analysis of the *fin de siècle* literary and cultural *gestalt*, and continues to influence current scholarship in the field. In his introduction to Fictions of Loss in the Victorian *fin de siècle* (1996), for example, Stephen Arata records his debt to Jackson for the conceptual framework of his fine study.

[8] I am not suggesting that the projects of realism and naturalism were identical for the French writers mentioned here. Rather, I wish to indicate that "the terms *realism* and *naturalism* were used interchangeably by nineteenth-century [English] critics," as Lyn Pykett points out (167).

[9] In Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel, Norman Feltes suggests that Lang was attacked during his lifetime by Marie Corelli [Isabella Mary Mackay], who modeled the character of "McWhing" on him in her Sorrows of Satan (1895).

[10] In "The Hidden History of English Studies," Brian Doyle examines "the long history" (18) of English studies to show how "'English language and literature' as a field of semantic and practical activity, did not simply arrive on the scene from nowhere, full and complete. It had to be worked for, constructed, forged out of struggles between differing lived meanings and cultural forms" (19).

[11] Longman's was never illustrated, with the exception of a Christmas 1884 number that was a miserable failure: the illustrations were fuzzy and it wound up costing the firm £750.

[12] See, for example, "At the Sign of the Ship," June 1887: 221; "At the Sign of the Ship," July 1890: 348.

[13] On the financial advantage of French writers, see "At the Sign of the Ship," Aug. 1886: 456-57.

Chapter Two
Eminent Bohemians:
Fictions of the Artist, the Artist's Model, and Late-Victorian Studio Culture

Even before Harper's New Monthly Magazine completed the serialization of Trilby in August 1894, admirers of Du Maurier's most recent fiction had begun to laud his narrative and artistic skills in print. Reviewers focussed on his charming representation of Trilby and "the old delicious Paris of the artist's youth" (James 342). "Straight upon our heart we feel the pressure of those divine white feet so admirably described by the author," wrote Henry James. "Where are they going to carry her beautiful high-perched young head and her passionate undomesticated heart? Through what devious, dusky turnings of the Latin Quarter and other quarters? We love her so much that we are vaguely uneasy for her; considerably inclined even to pray for her. Let us pray among other things that she may not grow any taller" (James 342). Here James wittily alludes to Du Maurier's penchant for penning tall women characters. Not only in Trilby but also in illustrations for Punch, among other periodicals, the stature of Du Maurier's attractive, aristocratic young women borders on the Amazonian. But James's comments about Trilby's youthful passion and her innocent vulnerability also anticipated later reviewers' explanations for the tremendous appeal of her character for readers. It was this paradoxical amalgam of innocence and experience that readers reiterated in their assessments of Trilby's winsome character as a way of explaining the novel's overwhelming popularity. And this depiction of Trilby was, for readers, always inextricably linked to the romance of Parisian art studio culture.

In a review for Harper's Weekly, Margaret Sangster echoed James's fondness for Trilby and emphasized the dual nature of Trilby's character as equal parts innocent child and sophisticated woman. "Trilby as a heroine is a marvelous creation," she enthused. "Beloved of all men, she captivates by sheer childlike unconsciousness, never by artifice or design. This large, fair, goddess-like woman is innocent of coquetry. It never occurs to her to seek to make an impression. She has the naivete of a baby, with the simple grace of one born to the purple" (Sangster 883). And in a later Harper's Weekly review, art critic Barnet Phillips lauded Du Maurier for his portrayal of studio culture in the 1850s: "In Trilby, Mr. Du Maurier describes the last renaissance, the modern art movement in France, and there is not in romance, or out of romance, or in any book written in English where it has been so admirably done. . . . Trilby is life—art life—seen through prismatic rays. Here are the rainbow colors. To a man who knew Paris, its ateliers, its art schools of forty-odd years ago, it is the most fascinating of modern books" (Phillips 222). While some critics, like James, Sangster, and Phillips, ascribed the novel's popularity to the reading public's fascination with art studio culture and Trilby's complex role as naive yet sexually experienced artist's model within that culture, others were content to abdicate all efforts to understand the novel's appeal. "Maga," the editorial persona adopted by Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, abandoned himself to the inscrutability of public taste with the comment, "Excellent Public! it knows what it likes. . . and no power can compel it to render a reason" ("Looker-on" 914).

In this chapter, I propose the popularity of the figure of the artist's model as one reason for Trilby's success with this "Excellent Public." My analysis of the late-Victorian artist's model is necessarily imbricated with concepts of "Bohemia" and with the shifting

fortunes of the artists who employed them. I begin, therefore, by sketching the contours of Bohemian identity as it was variously constructed throughout the nineteenth century. I then situate the shifting social and economic status of artists after the art boom of the 1860s in relation to popular stereotypes of the Bohemian artist and I analyse what was at stake in artists' self-representations in the 1880s and 1890s. I go on to consider how the figure of the artist's model became a recognizable type by the mid-1890s by charting a shift in representations of the artist's model from the early 1880s, when the model was subject to censorship, to the mid-1890s, when the model became a popular figure not only in fiction but also on the stage.

Despite this proliferation of artist's models as characters in fiction and on stage, the figure of the artist's model has remained curiously unexamined by Victorian literary scholars. Scholarship on late-Victorian sexual identities has, in the wake of Foucault, tended to concentrate on the emergence of male homosexuality as a category of identity and a range of what Richard Dellamora terms "dissident" sexual identities. Feminist scholarship has, in the discipline of history, emphasized the development of the women's suffrage movement and, in the discipline of English, focused on the figure of the New Woman, the late-Victorian rubric for the frank-speaking, cigarette-smoking, free-loving, vote-seeking woman of the mid-1890s.[1] But little attention has been paid to the social and sexual identities of working women as they get represented in late-Victorian culture. This chapter's attention to the artist's model, then, contributes to and draws on recent work on "types" of working women, including Peter Bailey on the barmaid, Tracy Davis on the actress, Christopher Keep on the typewriter-girl, and Judith Walkowitz on the prostitute.

A primary focus of this chapter is the mid-1880s debate about the nude in art. I focus at length on these debates as they get played out in the mainstream press because it is there that the contradictory narratives about the artist's model are made explicitly manifest. On the one hand, the model is construed by social purity activists as the innocent victim of sexually predatory male artists. On the other hand, she is represented as an honest muse and inspiration to high-minded artists. This preoccupation with the respectability of the artist's model is *the* pervasive characteristic of contemporary accounts of artistic life by artists, as well as of fictional and press representations. In these accounts, the artist's model teeters perilously between the positions of noble handmaiden to art and wretched prostitute. In the discussion of popular and literary representations of the artist's model that follows, I emphasize the contradictory narratives around the model's sexuality in which she is either a fallen woman or a muse. I suggest that the popularization of model stories in the 1890s featuring the model's upward class mobility is one means of covering over her implication in debates about morality and of reconciling these contradictions. I analyse first the mid-1880s controversy over realist representations of the nude and then the mid-1890s exploitation of the nude in popular texts. I focus on the banning of George Moore's first novel, A Modern Lover, by the circulating libraries because of a scene involving an artist's model and I examine the controversy that ensued in the periodical press, highlighting the extent to which the question of censorship hinged on the realistic representation of the model's body. I then turn to Trilby and Harry Greenbank's lyrics for An Artist's Model, among other representations, in which the model's sexuality is exploited rather than censored. In these texts, it is not the sexual connotations of the representation that risk exclusion, but rather

the material conditions of the model's employment which might disrupt the reading audience's romanticization of her role as muse.

My aim in the final section of this chapter is to provide some sense of the shift in identity that the figure of the artist's model undergoes in the last two decades of the nineteenth century. I also want to suggest that in spite of this shift in social identification, what remains constant in representations of her is the occlusion of her working body even as the figure of the artist's model is subject first to censorship in the 1880s and then exploitation in the 1890s. In fact, I want to suggest that the representational shift between the 1880s censorship and the 1890s exploitation of the artist's model may be more usefully configured on a continuum of occlusion rather than as two discrete cultural responses. Ultimately, I argue, the late-Victorian construction of masculine artistic identity and aesthetic authority, in which the studio plays a crucial role, relies on the domestication of the artist's model's labouring body.

Locating Bohemia

When the hero of W. Somerset Maugham's Of Human Bondage sets off in the mid-1890s to study art in Paris, Henri Mürger's 1845-49 series, Scènes de la Vie de Bohème, serves as the model of Bohemian studio life in which he hopes to participate. Maugham describes how "His soul danced with joy at that picture of starvation which is so good-humoured, of squalor which is so picturesque, of sordid love which is so romantic, of bathos which is so moving" (139). Once in Paris, Phillip Carey takes up the challenge posed by Mürger's representation. He sips absinthe at a café, debates aesthetics with other young art students, and remarks on the attire of some students who "'might have stepped out of the Vie de Bohème'" (183). He ultimately fails as an artist, but

Maugham's 1915 novel provides a rich snapshot of *fin de siècle* Bohemia, which, as Mürger famously declared, was "the preface to the Academy, the Hospital, or the Morgue" (qtd. in Brantlinger, "Bohemia" 35). For late-Victorian artists, there was no question that Bohemia promised if not an entrée to the Royal Academy, then at least the adventurous beginnings of a professional career. Like Maugham, late nineteenth-century artists and writers such as George Du Maurier, George Moore, and James McNeill Whistler spent time as art students in the "Bohemian idyll" that was Paris. They also wrote about this apprenticeship as Bohemia came increasingly to signify a necessary chapter in the development of a successful artist.

In Maugham's novel, as in such memoirs, Bohemian artists are characterized by external codes of dress and behaviour, and by their youth. Indeed, their break with the conventions of the past is a sign of their Bohemian identity. As the pompous Lawson intones, "damn the Great Victorians. Whenever I open a paper and see Death of a Great Victorian, I thank Heaven there's one more of them gone. Their only talent was longevity, and no artist should be allowed to live after he's forty" (187). Other important accoutrements of Maugham's Bohemian artist are a mistress, "part of the paraphernalia of the art-student in Paris" (203) and a model. And, as suggested by the artists' relationships to Ruth Chalice—indolent artist, "excellent sitter" (226), and aesthetic wanton—often mistress and model are one and the same. For Maugham's artists, this conflation of mistress and model, of sexual and professional identities, seems to be good for artistic development, not to mention their Bohemian reputations.

By 1915, when Maugham's novel was published, the artist's model had assumed certain recognizable characteristics in the British cultural imagination. She was, for

starters, a woman, the product of a century-long process of feminization that art historian Frances Borzello has documented. She was also, like Ruth Chalice, an object of desire for artists. Yet despite her sexual desirability and availability, there was something innocent about her. In his 1936 memoir, for example, playwright and author Clifford Bax described his encounters with Hilda, an artist's model, in his youth. Hilda had, he insisted, an "innocent sentimentality" (85) and "a sweetness that was irresistible" (90). In Arthur Ransome's 1907 memoir, Bohemia in London, the artist's model conceives of modeling as a vocation, not merely a job. In addition to her tireless posing, she cooks and mends for the artist, cares for him when he is ill, coaxes him when he needs encouragement, and comments on his progress with unfailing cheer. She is an ideal domestic worker and her storied past serves only to render her a more interesting companion. As Ransome notes, "There is rich material for novelists in the lives of these girls" (74). Some even have "stories that read like penny novelettes" (74). And in Confessions of a Young Man, George Moore's autobiographical novel first published in 1888, the very presence of models contributes to the consecration of the artist's studio as a Bohemian space. The narrator comments on the necessary ingredients for "a studio—tapestries, smoke, models, conversations" (53). In these literary and artistic memoirs of the *fin de siècle*, such stories of artist's models become perfunctory narratives that function as a sign of the author's Bohemian past.

The artist's model was not always the sign *par excellence* of the artist's Bohemian identity. Youth, poverty, and the avowal of anti-bourgeois ideology, however, were consistently *de rigueur* in stereotypes of the bohemian. As Joanna Richardson has argued in her study of nineteenth-century French Bohemian life, the 1830 production of Victor

Hugo's Hernani in Paris marked the definitive emergence of the Romantic Bohemian as a cultural figure. Audiences perceived the controversial play as "a showdown between romanticism and classicism and as an apotheosis of the battle between the moderns and the ancients that had been raging for at least two decades" (Gluck 354). The battle over Hernani became one between youth and age, in this instance between the admirers of Hugo and the new literature, and the defenders of classical drama, with its insistence on the classical unities of time, place, and action. Yet even in their self-representation as crusaders for the new, the Bohemian defenders of Hugo styled their appearances after no longer fashionable conventions by donning beards, long hair, and historical costumes. To flout the conventions of bourgeois dress was to draw upon the fashions of the past by modeling themselves "on characters from Renaissance paintings, romantic dramas, and Gothic novels" (Gluck 356). Mary Gluck is careful to point out, however, that this Bohemian medievalism ought not to be construed as mere "historical nostalgia" (358), but rather indicates the extent to which contemporary popular culture—"Gothic novels, fashionable romances, romantic dramas, and melodramas" (358)—served as the source for its construction. At base, this Bohemian identity associated the Bohemian not with a reactionary politics, but with a subversive early manifestation of later "radical youth movements" (Gluck 358).

Despite the radical nature of this early French Bohemian movement, Gluck's analysis also demonstrates how quickly the containment of cultural subversion occurred. Drawing on Dick Hebdige's work on subcultural styles, Gluck shows how, within a decade, Bohemianism became both fashionable among the bourgeoisie and the object of satire in mainstream journals. By the late 1840s, Bohemianism no longer constituted an

avant-garde movement among artists, but was an outmoded form that would soon be replaced by the figure of the *flâneur*. Gluck's analysis demonstrates the connections between "the bohemian as social type" and "the bohemian as aesthetic creator" (352) in order to ground Walter Benjamin's theoretical assertion that the Bohemian artist was at once radicalized and commodified because of the tensions of capitalism. Her work is a useful point of departure for a brief analysis of Victorian constructions of English Bohemianism, which, despite its cachet as a category of identity for late-Victorian artists and writers, has received little notice from subsequent critics, with the exception of Christopher Kent and Patrick Brantlinger.

In his analysis of "the idea of Bohemia in mid-Victorian England," Kent traces the importation from France to England of the idea of Bohemia. He ascribes this importation to Thackeray, whose residence as an art student in Paris in the 1830s became the basis for his Sketches of Paris Life and whose familiarity with Bohemia resulted in its insertion into the text of Vanity Fair (1848). "By the 1850s," Kent notes, "[Bohemia] was becoming fairly well established in English usage" (361). Unlike Paris, however, where the Latin Quarter was the identifiable location of Bohemian existence, London lacked a similar Bohemian address. Because London was not a university city in the way that Paris was, Bohemian London was oriented by professional rather than student interests. The topography of Bohemian London was more diffuse than in Paris, and tended to be constituted around the professions of its inhabitants. Artists, for example, generally inhabited Soho, Charlotte Street, and Fitzroy Square; writers congregated in Holborn, Fleet Street, and the Inns of Court; and theatre people lived in Islington, Lambeth, and Brompton. Within this diffuse topography, Kent identifies the club as "the quintessential

institution of Victorian Bohemia" (362) and uses the Garrick Club Affair, in which Dickens opposed Edmund Yates's 1858 expulsion from the Garrick Club, to illustrate not only "the connection between the gentleman and Bohemia" (362) but also the extent to which Bohemian identity was forged out of generational conflict. In his example, the older and professionally established members of the club rallied around Thackeray, who called for the expulsion because of Yates's caricature of Thackeray in a weekly journal, while the younger members supported Dickens. Like Gluck, Kent points to the containment of Bohemian subversion, emphasizing "the cyclical nature of Bohemia" (361). He remarks that "the periodic crises in Bohemia occur when it has been oversold, and the bourgeoisie as a result of literary over-exposure temporarily abdicate their responsibility of being shocked and begin to partake of Bohemia, though in a highly commercialized way" (361).

Patrick Brantlinger's analysis of late-Victorian Bohemia is similarly interested in the commercialization and commodification of Bohemia. In "Bohemia Versus Grub Street: Artists' and Writers' Communities in Nineteenth-Century Paris and London," Brantlinger explores the differences between the two "places," which are to be understood more accurately as "conditions." Although "Grub Street" had already "passed into the language as a metaphor for the commercialization of literature" (25) by 1891 when Gissing published New Grub Street, the connotations of Bohemia were not strictly limited to the literary. Brantlinger contrasts the "idea of Bohemia. . . as an anarchic association of artists, writers and students opposed to bourgeois commercialism" (26) with the "relentlessly dismal affair" (25) of the bourgeois co-optation of writers in Grub Street, using Gissing's novel and Trilby as useful illustrations of this opposition.

Brantlinger reads both novels as mimetic: "the contrast between Trilby and New Grub Street. . . reflects actual conditions of artistic and literary production in nineteenth-century Paris and London" (26). Ultimately, the contrast between the novels is "more than one between the gay and gloomy personalities of their authors--it is also one between the flourishing community of artists, writers and students in Paris and the absence of such a community on any large scale in London" (40). To insist on the mimetic function of the novels suits Brantlinger's purposes; the opposition between Trilby and New Grub Street is an apt frame for his careful and compelling discussion of the differences between the material conditions of artistic production in Paris and London throughout the nineteenth century. But it also elides important similarities in the production of narratives about this art. Gissing and Du Maurier may represent such material differences between Paris in the 1850s and London in the 1890s, but they are both writing in England in the 1890s. Brantlinger is not interested in the extent to which Gissing's and Du Maurier's metaphorical locations participate in a specifically English debate. Art for Little Billee fails to function as "a weapon in the Bohemian warfare against bourgeois conformity' (40). No less than for Arthur Pendennis, David Copperfield and Edwin Reardon is art "the tool by which [he seeks] to maintain [his] bourgeois lifestyle and to achieve respectability" (40).

Since the concept of Bohemia had assumed currency in English after Thackeray's popularization of the term, it had connoted the social relationships between artists and the general public, specifically relationships of class. In an anonymous 1865 article on "Bohemians and Bohemianism" in the Cornhill Magazine, the author reiterated the Westminster Review's earlier assertion that "a Bohemian is simply an artist or litterateur

who, consciously or unconsciously, secedes from conventionality in life and in art" (1862). The Cornhill author remarked, "By a Bohemian, for present purposes, is meant a gentleman who, being no worse born, or bred, or educated than other folks, is yet, through some strong peculiarity of temperament in the first instance, acted on by circumstances in the second, alienated from society in its established, conventional, and certainly very convenient sense" (241). And yet what Kent's, Brantlinger's, and Gluck's descriptions of Bohemia tacitly share, and what the Cornhill author suggests by omission, is the distinctly gendered nature of the concept or space they examine. After the turn of the century, journalist and playwright George R. Sims recalled in his Recollections of Sixty Years of Bohemian London "the merry little coterie" of Bohemians, "every member of which had made or was making a name in journalism, in literature, in art, or in the drama" (330). His lamentation for "the passing of the old tavern life" (330) is notable not just for its tone of nostalgia, which is a consistent feature of such memoirs of *fin de siècle* Bohemia, but also for its demarcation of Bohemia as a singularly masculine space. In 1916, when Sims published his memoir, Bohemia's demise was signaled by new social relationships between men and women as much as by new urban spaces that had usurped the function of taverns and cafes. Sims's elegiac tone suggests that women's exclusion from Bohemian spaces was one condition of possibility *for* the construction of such spaces *as* Bohemian. He laments, "Where will you find a 'song and supper room' with a dozen men famous as artists, as writers, as advocates, as scientists, eating their chops, smoking their pipes, drinking their hot grog at midnight, and listening to an entertainment in which no woman takes part, held in a popular establishment through the portals of which no petticoat is allowed to pass?" (330).

I want to suggest that Trilby participated in the contemporary constructions of Bohemia that I have outlined both in its textual representation of the Latin Quarter in the late 1850s and in Harpers' transatlantic marketing of the novel. At the level of textual representation, Du Maurier depicts the artist's studio as the location for a coterie of young male artists to explore their nascent artistic skills and their relationships with one another. In Du Maurier's configuration, the character of Trilby, although present in the studio, serves merely to buttress these relationships as the object around which masculine artistic and emotional development coalesces. And at the extratextual level of marketing, Harpers and American artist James McNeill Whistler enjoyed mutually beneficial promotion when Whistler sued the publishing firm in order to protest Du Maurier's caricaturing of Whistler as the minor character "Joe Sibley." Whistler's insistence on the expurgation from Trilby's narrative of the character based on him functioned to reinforce the veracity of Du Maurier's representation of Bohemian Paris to readers. The explicit references in Du Maurier's illustrations to living artists like Whistler made the novel seem less a construction of a fantastic Bohemia than a realistic reflection of Parisian studio culture. At the same time, Whistler's intervention into the publishing process is an example of how Bohemia might be commodified and used to advantage by artists who were increasingly aware of and invested in their public images. As Du Maurier would point out in a private letter, it seemed that Whistler considered bad publicity better than no publicity at all.

In the third instalment of the novel (March 1894) in Harper's New Monthly Magazine, Du Maurier introduced the character of Joe Sibley. This was one of many short depictions of the art student *confreres* of Taffy, Sandy, and Little Billee. These minor

characters were based on actual aspiring artists Du Maurier had known in Paris during his student days at the Swiss painter Charles Gleyre's studio in the late 1850s. These thinly disguised sketches of artists like Alecco Ionides, Edward Poynter (as "Lorrimer, the industrious apprentice" (578)), and Arthur Lewis rendered the novel, in part, a *roman à clef*. The character of Joe Sibley was based on Whistler, who had fraternized with the coterie of English artists like Du Maurier, Poynter, and Armstrong after his 1855 arrival in Paris from America. In Du Maurier's third instalment of Trilby, a small illustration of "the Two Apprentices" accompanied the description of Joe Sibley and made clear the character's identification as Whistler. Sibley is described as "the idle apprentice, the king of bohemia, *le roi des truands*" (577) and is pictured wearing the clothes of a dandy and smoking a cigarette. The other illustrated apprentice, who bears the canvas and paints of his profession, is the character of Lorrimer, a thinly veiled portrait of Poynter, who was, in reality, reviled by Whistler. In comparison to the hard-working and future Royal Academician Lorrimer, Sibley is compared to Svengali: "Always in debt, like Svengali; like Svengali, vain, witty, and a most exquisite and original artist; and also eccentric in his attire (though clean), so that people would stare at him as he walked along—which he adored! But (unlike Svengali) he was genial, caressing, sympathetic, charming; the most irresistible friend in the world as long as his friendship lasted—but that was not for-ever!" (577).

As biographer Leonée Ormond explains, Du Maurier's representation of Whistler as Joe Sibley was based neither on his friendship with Whistler in the late 1850s nor on first-hand experience. Du Maurier's description of events pertaining to Sibley/Whistler alluded specifically to Whistler's later encounters with friends and foes, including

Poynter, in Paris. Whistler responded immediately with ire to Du Maurier's representation.[2] He wrote a letter to the Pall Mall Gazette which was published on 15 May 1894. In it he complained, "Now that my back is turned, the old *marmite* of our *pot-au-feu* [Du Maurier] fills with the picric acid of thirty years' spite, and, in an American Magazine, fires off his bomb of mendacious recollection and poisoned rancune" (qtd. in Ormond 466). Whistler's anger did not find its sole outlet in the periodical press. In keeping with the litigiousness he had demonstrated in 1877, when he sued Ruskin for libel over Ruskin's public criticisms of his Nocturne in Black and Gold: The Falling Rocket, Whistler immediately undertook legal proceedings to halt further dissemination of Trilby and to sue Du Maurier and Harpers for libel. The agreement finally reached between Whistler and Harpers on 18 July 1894 "stipulated that Harpers would stop the sale of the March number of the European edition of their magazine and any future sale, that they would publish a public letter of apology either in September or October, that they would alter the book version and remove the offending passages [and illustrations], and that they would pay Whistler's legal costs not exceeding ten guineas" (Ormond 475). They also agreed to "write to Mr. Whistler and sign a letter of regret in the terms contained in the Schedule hereto and Mr. Whistler may publish same in any papers or publication he may think fit" (Harper). At Harpers' behest, Du Maurier created a new character, Bald Anthony, to replace that of Joe Sibley, and the book version which appeared in September 1894 included no trace of Sibley/Whistler, with the exception of an illustration of "Taffy à l'echelle" in which the unaltered Sibley/Whistler character appeared in the background.

In a 7 June 1894 letter to Harpers' London representative, McIlvaine, Du Maurier astutely suggested that Whistler's very public outrage could be construed as a strategic ploy to garner publicity for himself. Du Maurier wrote, "What he wants is notoriety, an advertisment [sic] - he has always been mad for that sort of thing - rather than not advertise himself he would almost advertise 'Trilby'" (Harper). Legal correspondence in the Harpers Collection at the Pierpont Morgan Library bears out Du Maurier's intuition that Whistler aimed to milk the situation for as much self-promotion as he could. On 23 June 1894, Harpers lawyer E.J. Gurdon reported to Harpers executive Stirling about Whistler's demands: "[Whistler's lawyer] Webb called here on Thursday last & told me that Whistler would want the illustration on p. 579 omitted from the book-form publication & that he wanted publicity given to Harpers' expression of regret. He said it must be advertised in certain London & New York papers, aiming about a dozen. This I said was going too far; it meant expense & unnecessary self-humiliation for an accidental error, rectified as soon as discovered" (Harper). The punctuation Whistler employed in correspondence to his legal counsel at the time suggests the extent to which he was incensed over the matter: "[Harpers] don't understand me -- and they don't dream that *I really don't care how much the March number* circulates *directly* the letter of apology and full explanation is published in all papers to accompany it!!! Indeed the more Mr Du Maurier's wretched stuff is read, the more *terribly* clear will his humiliation be to the whole people!" (qtd. in Ormond 475). He had initially hoped to stop the circulation of the March issue in which the offending passage and illustration appeared, but this was impossible since the issue had largely sold out. As this excerpt suggests, however, Whistler was not concerned with the circulation of the March number as long as an

equally widely circulated apology followed close on its heels. In the end Whistler had to content himself with Harpers' publication, in the October number of Harpers New Monthly Magazine and in various London newspapers, of an official letter of apology. That Whistler fully intended to make use of the episode to further his own career by including it in a revised edition of The Gentle Art of Making Enemies was made explicit in a letter to his publisher, William Heinemann, dated 9 November 1894: "What about The Gentle Art? It will be time soon to begin preparations for a new Edition - Meanwhile I think I must put together all the Du Maurier campaign and let you have it set up that we may see how it looks! - We can thus get it into pretty shape" (Harper). In a postscript he added jubilantly, "I fancy I have wiped up Hampstead and manured the Heath with Du Maurier!" (Harper).

The competition between Whistler and Du Maurier that this correspondence lays bare and the competition among art students in studio more generally were downplayed at the level of narrative in Trilby. The novel represents Bohemia as a collectively supportive environment in which all the characters are striving to achieve success and fame, ambitions which are rendered possible not by skills like marketing savvy and self-promotion but strictly by talent.

Artists at Home

The emergence of the artist's model as a contested identity occurred at a moment when "the social identities and professional associations of artists" (Cherry 86) were also undergoing significant changes, including new patterns of patronage and professional rituals. As Dianne Sachko Macleod has documented, middle-class patrons supplanted the aristocracy and members of the landed gentry as the main purchasers of contemporary art

by mid-century. By the time of the second Reform Act of 1867, the middle class had consolidated its position as the predominant British class. The ostentatious display of accumulated wealth was an important means of conveying this class status. For businessmen and other middle-class professionals, the acquisition and collection of art became a popular mode of such display. In the 1860s, then, when business interests were recovering from the economic recession of the late 1850s, a boom in picture-making occurred as middle-class patrons sought to demonstrate their economic and cultural staying power by acquiring art. Individual artists and the profession of art benefited from this boom, the former by material success and the latter by the cultural esteem increasingly accorded to artists. For the first time, as Leonore Davidoff has suggested, artists acceded to "Society." Despite the strictures of Court etiquette which had previously excluded professional actors and tradespeople from presentation or participation, "Society" circles began to enlarge their memberships to the newly wealthy. Both artists and their businessmen patrons became eligible for new social status, and aristocrats endorsed the project of art as admirers and consumers.

One of the ways in which "Society" maintained its elite status was by the public display of ostensibly private events occurring throughout the Season. By the 1880s, art exhibitions and shows comprised part of this Season. Following the social conventions of their upper-class clients, artists began to present their work "at home," and the artist's studio rather than the gallery came to serve as the artistic marketplace. Establishment artists commissioned architects to design homes with attached studios, and new art institutions like the Grosvenor Gallery hosted visits to the studios of fashionable artists. Even the interior decoration of the artist's studio came to function as an "important tool

for artists struggling for commercial success while seeming not to" (Burns 49). Indeed, the artist's studio became an important site for the display of what art historian Sarah Burns calls "art atmosphere"—fashionable studio decor and bric-à-brac to make the artist's studio "attractive and to advertise both producer and product" (Burns 58). Descriptions and illustrations of artist's studios appeared everywhere in the popular press and contributed to the public's appetite for private details of the lives of public figures.

These popular late-Victorian representations of artists, their homes, and studios may be understood on a continuum of representations of "figures of public recognition in late nineteenth-century journalistic discourse" (Salmon 159). "Biographical interest in the homes of famous [figures]" (Salmon 164) was nothing new in the 1880s, as Richard Salmon suggests in his analysis of interviews with authors. But, as he compellingly demonstrates, technologies of photographic reproduction and features of the New Journalism functioned paradoxically both to create readerly intimacy with the biographical subject and to "mystify his status by couching social distinction in terms of private experience" (174). Late-Victorian artists were one focus of the reading public's biographical interest in celebrity figures and were subject to the simultaneous familiarization and mystification that Salmon describes.

Julie F. Codell's meticulous research on the representation of artists in biographical series and the periodical press has shown how artists actively participated in the shaping of their public images at this moment. "Through interviews and photographs of their homes, studios, and bodies, and reproductions of sketches and drawings that appeared to translate the creative process into labor, artists collaborated with the press to represent a new professional image" (Codell, "Constructing" 285). As Codell has

suggested, artists needed to work to achieve this image because of "the conflict between their recent material success as a class that gave them a new national profile, and stereotypes of them as degenerate or bohemian" (Codell, "Constructing" 282). By the 1880s, these stereotypes had shifted from "the earlier, dramatic 'unreachable' Romantic model" to "the late-century figure of the biologically condemned, degenerate genius" (Codell, "Serialized" 98). In the face of such representations in both popular fiction and degeneration theory by scientists like Max Nordau and Cesar Lombroso, artists participated in "counter-representation[s]" (Codell, "Serialized" 99) in books and in the periodical press. In what follows, I present three examples of such "counter-representations," including an individual article, a biographical series subsequently published in book form, and a regular weekly column that devoted substantial attention to the venue of the artist's studio. I want to show how these representations, in contrast to popular representations of the Bohemian artist, undertake the cultural work of affirming the bourgeois respectability of the artist.

On 24 August 1884, the American weekly Century Magazine featured Cosmo Monkhouse's article on "Some English Artists and Their Studios." The article follows many of the conventions outlined by Codell in her discussion of periodical representations of artists' studios: it assumes as its object the studios of eminent artists, in this case sanctioned by membership in the Royal Academy (with the exception of James Drogmole Linton, all mentioned artists—Frederic Leighton, John Everett Millais, John Pettie, Val Prinsep, George Boughton, Philip Morris, and Lawrence Alma-Tadema—were RA members); it describes the studios in exhaustive detail; and it provides accompanying illustrations so the reader may more accurately conjure the artist's work space.

Monkhouse's detailed description of the orientalist decor of Leighton's studio, which includes Persian, Egyptian, and Arabian elements, is similar to descriptions in J.K. Huysmans' Against Nature (1884) and Oscar Wilde's Picture of Dorian Gray (1891). The article also argues for the commensurability of artist and studio. In this formulation, the studio conveys a range of moral and identificatory connotations and thus serves as a metonym for the character of the artist. In the case of Frederic Leighton, for example, "the artist and the studio, the man and the house, fit one another—a fact which is no small compliment to either" (554). The article's verbal and visual snapshot of the studio establishes Leighton's cultural and moral authority, as Monkhouse's allusion to Matthew Arnold makes clear: "Sir Frederick's [sic] house is a temple of 'sweetness and light,' and he is the cultured priest thereof" (554).

F.G. Stephens's Artists at Home, published in 1884, performs similar work to Monkhouse's earlier article in rendering the studio a "rich [symbol] of artistic, moral and national character" (Codell, "Constructing" 293). Not an artist but a critic, Stephens was an original member of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood and art critic for the Athenaeum from 1861 to 1901. Published initially as a six-part monthly series at five shillings per part, Artists at Home illustrates features of both artists' biographies and the New Journalism, with its emphasis on interviews and photographic illustration. In particular, Artists at Home took advantage of "the introduction of the Rapid Dry Plate" (n.p.) in the photographic process to present readers a more authentic rendition of the artist's studio. As publishers Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington acknowledged in a "Note" to the text, "The process by which these photographs have been reproduced on copper plates, though not absolutely new, has now for the first time been so modified as to make

it possible to give tints so often found wanting in the photograph from which they are taken, and which have hitherto been a characteristic only of high-class steel engravings" (n.p.). Unlike other articles, like Monkhouse's, which provided illustrations of the artist's empty studio, Stephens's series offered photographs of the artist *in* his studio. With the exception of Robert Walker Macbeth, A.R.A., each of the other twenty-two artists appears in the studio photo, which is transformed, by virtue of his presence, into a portrait. Notably absent from Stephens's and Monkhouse's representations, as from virtually all contemporary representations of artists' studios, was the figure of the artist's model.[3] As Codell points out, "the 'domestic affairs' of artists were rarely presented in serialized biographies" ("Serialized" 111). Nor were the models on whose labour the artists' lucrative careers depended.

Detailed discussions of artists' studios and homes were not merely the purview of serialized biographies, special publications, or art critics in the periodical press, however. As artists' studios became fashionable locations for "Society" events, coverage of studio visits and descriptions of studios also appeared in press columns we might now consider "Society Pages." Florence Fenwick-Miller's "Ladies' Column" in the Illustrated London News is a case in point. Once described by the Chicago Sunday Inter-Ocean as "'perhaps one of the best known women of the world'" (qtd. in VanArsdel 108), Fenwick-Miller was a journalist, suffragist, and platform speaker who, in addition to many other editorial and speaking engagements, wrote this weekly column for the ILN from 1886 to 1918.

In early columns, events such as "the distribution of prizes to the pupils of the Female School of Art by the Marchioness of Salisbury" (13 March 1886: 257) and "the private view of the Academy" (8 May 1886: 477) are accorded several paragraphs each.

Fenwick-Miller's descriptions of these events inevitably mention famous artists and their wives, but the focus tends to be the fashions sported by "Society" women. In her May 1886 synopsis of the private viewing at the Royal Academy, for example, the reference to Mrs. Alma Tadema describes "her similar fair hair frizzed up before and behind a small flat untrimmed fold of black lace by way of bonnet" (477), and artist Val Prinsep receives less notice than does "his wife in blue braided with silver" (477). Whereas artists' wives' raiments receive the lion's share of attention in columns about Royal Academy and gallery shows, artists' studios are subject to comparable scrutiny and description in columns devoted to weekend visits to artists' studios. In the latter columns, consideration of the new spring fashion styles, as evoked by elaborate descriptions of ladies' dresses, sleeves, mantles, and bonnets worn at artists' "at homes," shares space with consideration of the decorative style of the artist's studio.

In April 1887 Fenwick-Miller reported on "visiting Sundays" at artists' studios, pointing out what she perceived as the fictional quality of the "gorgeous chambers" and "sumptuous apartments" that "exist only, or at all events mainly, in the vast imagination of a Miss Braddon or a 'Ouida'. The studio of real life, the workshop of the actual artist, is apt to be a big bare chamber almost or quite uncarpeted, and flooded with a cruelly keen light" (2 April 1887: 379). But this "studio of real life" is nowhere to be found in her reportage of the "visiting Sundays," which more closely approximates the fictional descriptions she derides as inauthentic. She was forced to acknowledge the extent to which artists did gussy up their studios in the service of sales on these show days: "Mr. Schmalz's studio comes, in its reality, very near the word-sketches of fancy. It is a large room, the walls painted a delicate green; inside the door is placed a large porch of richly-

carved black oak, from the top of which a palm bends over; tall bureaus in black and light oak, Eastern inlaid stools, dried palms upon the walls and fresh ones in pots on every hand, make up a really artistic and charming chamber" (379). Other noted decorations included swathes of fabric draped across walls, tea-services in use, and glass and carved work on display.

The work required to prepare the artist's studio for visitors and potential customers, and the work of artists' self-representation in print was necessary at this moment because of the improved status of the artist. Indeed, in an April 1889 column, Fenwick-Miller identified studio visits and the opening of the Royal Academy as indicators of "the height of the London Season" (6 April 1889: 448). The social importance accorded studio visits is suggested by the presence of the Prince and Princess of Wales, Princess Mary, and her daughter at the studios on the previous Sunday. If the studios were decorated to show the artwork to best advantage, however, Fenwick-Miller noted that the artists themselves could not claim a similar bearing: "The artists... generally bear the aspect of sufferers on these occasions, and do not show to the same advantage as their works in their studios" (448). In an effort to explain the needful invitation of guests to their studios despite artists' general misery at such events, she chalked it up to fashion. "Why do they invite you, then? Fashion, pure and simple—fashion requires studio invitations" (448). But Fenwick-Miller's ascription of Sunday studio open houses to the dictates of fashion was somewhat disingenuous. As Leonore Davidoff has pointed out, and as I have already suggested, "sales of work," "exhibitions," and "picture shows" comprised part of the Season by the 1880s (65). Ostensibly private events like the races at Ascot or afternoon visits to artists' studios performed an important

"display function" which was crucial to the maintenance of "Society's" power. Despite the ostensible exclusivity of such events, that is, they circulated in the public sphere in locations like Fenwick-Miller's column.

Novels of the period do not always bear out Fenwick-Miller's insistence that fiction inevitably got it wrong by exaggeration. In Ella Hepworth Dixon's Story of A Modern Woman (1894), for example, the artist's studio is presented as an elaborately decorated affair but this decoration is simultaneously acknowledged as necessary in the competitive arena of art, in which the studio has come to serve as the site of exchange. In Hepworth Dixon's novel, the sensible heroine Mary Erle abandons the paintbrush in favour of the pen. After a stint at the fictional Central London School of Art, she assumes the position of a freelance "lady journalist." One of her first assignments is a review of the new Royal Academy show and an interview with Perry Jackson, a newly elected RA member and a comrade from her art school days. He invites her around to his studio, a large home in Kensington that he purchased from a passé Academician. Jackson has made his money on commercial reproductions of his most famous painting of a young girl surrounded by roses: "in America they give away an autogravure of that picture with every pound of Scourer's Soap and every bottle of Parkins' Pain-killer" (145). When Mary queries him about the responsibility of such a large home and studio, he responds confidentially: "Bless you,... it's all for show! I live in a little room at the back; couldn't be bothered to sit down and eat my mutton-chop in that great big gold and amber dining-room. Oh! no. Not for this infant. But it fetches the public no end. Why, I've had any amount of tip-top swells there already. They come in and say, 'What a *perfectly* beautiful

house, Mr. Jackson. What *exquisite* taste! Where *did* you get that cabinet? I wonder now, if I were to ask *very* prettily, if you could find time to paint my portrait?'" (147).

Hepworth Dixon's characterization of Perry Jackson is worth describing because it isolates two interlocking possibilities for financial success for late-Victorian artists, namely the appropriation of art in the service of a rapidly expanding market in commodity advertising and the savvy use of the artist's studio as a venue for the marketing of art. In this use of the studio to encourage visitors "to buy expensive objects with high exchange value and no material use whatsoever," Sarah Burns points out that artists' aims closely "coincided with those of late-nineteenth-century retailers. To sell their goods, both had to perform and perfect the strategies of the showman" (53). As my earlier examples of studio descriptions suggest, however, the studio was not only a location for commodity exchange but also *became* a commodity for sale in and of itself. Representations of artists' studios encouraged brisk sales of newspapers, magazines, and specialty books. And yet the discourse of art criticism continued to assert artists' disinterest in and disavowal of the commercial marketplace. The engagement of successful artists in constructing their studios as elaborate, exotic art markets while seeming not to suggests that the concept of Bohemia, construed by Mürger and others as a subversion of bourgeois values, actually gets commodified and marketed by successful late-Victorian artists in the service of professional advancement. In this moment, the artist's model becomes a site of contestation because her sexuality at once promises to consolidate the artist's Bohemian identity and to undermine his claims to bourgeois respectability.

Even the architecture of artists' homes and studios complicated artists' claims to the moral respectability of the artist's model.[4] Artists wanted to claim the model as muse and inspiration, and yet the cultural geography of the household made impossible her identification as anything but a domestic worker. Like other servants, models entered the home by the servants' stairs in order to avoid tainting the domestic sphere with any signs of their presence. Anne McClintock's analysis of the cult of domesticity in Imperial Leather is instructive with regard to the model's contradictory identification because McClintock elucidates "the historical dichotomy between women's paid work and women's unpaid work in the home" (138). In response to critics who have too readily accepted the leisure of the middle-class woman as the sign of her class affiliation, McClintock argues that the middle-class "housewife's vocation was precisely the concealment of this [unpaid domestic] work" (162). "A wife's vocation was not only to create a clean and productive family but also to ensure the skilled erasure of every *sign* of her work. Her life took shape around the contradictory imperative of laboring while rendering her labor invisible. Her success as a wife depended on her skill in the art of both working and appearing not to work" (162). In McClintock's argument, the parlor marks "the threshold of private and public" (162), the location for the conspicuous display of middle-class household commodities that serve an exhibition value rather than a use value. In this household economy, the servant's invisibility is necessary to the maintenance of the fiction of leisure: "The wife's labor of leisure and the servant's labor of invisibility served to disavow and conceal within the middle-class formation the economic value of women's work" (164). And the servant's constant negotiation and breaching of the public/private divide in her daily activities of shopping and cleaning

threatened to infect the home with the odour of the marketplace. McClintock's analysis of domestic labour is striking in its similarity to the artistic labour that occurs in the artist's studio.

Models and Morals

The professional artist's model was not an innovation of the nineteenth century. As Oscar Wilde noted in his 1889 essay on "London Models," the professional artist's model was "the direct creation of Academic Schools" (313). Since the Royal Academy opened its doors to students in 1769, drawing from the nude model had been an important component of professional artist training. Students progressed from drawing from drawings, to drawing from casts, and ultimately to drawing from life. "Life drawing class was therefore the pinnacle of training, master of life drawing the proof of professional skill" (Borzello 18). Even in the eighteenth century, however, the female artist's model was tainted by the fear of immorality. The Royal Academy established regulations for the conduct between female models and male artists, imposing age restrictions on the artists, banning outsiders from the studios, and prohibiting talking during sessions.

Throughout the course of the nineteenth century, the status of the artist's model was yoked to questions of morality. But the question of morality was not restricted to the model herself. It inevitably impinged on the reputation of the artist for whom she sat. In April 1858, for example, Household Words published "Calmuck," Robert Brough's story about an artist, his model, and her jealous husband. William Holman Hunt perceived the story as a thinly veiled satirical account of his affair with a model, and actually wrote to editor Charles Dickens requesting that the journal print an apology. Suspecting that an apology would serve only to draw further attention, Dickens refused. In Wilkie Collins's

1882-83 novel Heart and Science, the morality of the artist's model threatens to taint her future husband and offspring with impropriety. The now deceased mother of the orphaned heroine Carmina Graywell was Italian and a model to boot. The narrator notes that "having already outraged the sense of propriety among his English neighbours, he [Carmina's father Robert Graywell] now degraded himself in the estimation of his family, by marrying a 'model'" (73). The narrator makes clear, however, that she was virtous, sitting "for the head only" (73). This distinction between mere modeling and nude modeling means nothing to the villainous and snobbish Mrs. Gallilee, who speaks of her brother's "'disgraceful marriage'" and his "'disgusting wife'" (193). For Mrs. Gallilee, Carmina's Italian heritage and her mother's occupation as artist's model combine to connote social inferiority. That Mrs. Gallilee's primary concern is Carmina's class status is made apparent by her reference to literacy. "'It's notorious,'" she insists, "'. . . that Italian models don't know how to read or write'" (194).

Despite these lingering cultural connotations of immorality and illiteracy, some art historians have described the period between 1870 and 1914 as "the golden age of the artist's model." Certainly the demand for models increased in the 1870s with the boom in picture-making and continued to increase throughout the century with the expansion of national education and the founding of art schools. In her 1895 directory of Art Schools in London, Tessa Mackenzie lists more than eighty schools and studios, most of which offer classes where students draw from both the draped model and the nude figure. Whether she is describing the protocol at large institutions like the Royal Academy Schools and the Slade, or at smaller private studios run by artists, the general consensus is the same. By 1895, women and men were equally eligible to attend art school, but life classes for

painting from the nude model were segregated. It is relevant that debates about the artist's model occurred at a moment when women were making inroads into art education and were threatening the idea of the studio as a male preserve. As we shall see in Trilby and An Artist's Model, the studio gets represented at the *fin de siècle* as a site of social and sexual freedom that is not subject to the taboos that police other private spaces. And the artist's model functions as an "essential prop" and a sign of this freedom in popular representations of the artist's studio. Whether writers were defending or repudiating the profession of the artist's model, they always assumed their position in relation to the question of morality. The female artist's model functioned, then, as a type or sign that got used in debates about morality, censorship, and art. These debates about respectability were fought on the grounds of the model's nude body and what her nudity meant for her, for artists painting her, and for viewers looking at her. Was the representation of nudity in and of itself a corrupting force? Or did it better reveal the "truth" of nature by providing a window onto the soul of the person represented?

Poet W. H. Auden, like most artists and writers of the late nineteenth century before him, assumed the latter position. In the 1930s, he commented to an artist friend that "leading politicians should be painted nude, in order that their naked bodies could reveal their corrupt natures" (qtd. in Postle 51). Such a suggestion would not have been anachronistic in the 1880s, when the question of morality was at the centre of public debates about the nude in art and when the crusade to ban the professional female model was at its height. The nude had enjoyed a renaissance in the late 1860s and early 1870s as a result of the commercial expansion of the art market and the campaign to reform the system of English art education. This campaign involved the advocacy of live models

over antique statuary, the traditional subject matter for beginning English art students. As artists gained increased access to the living model, however, the moral crusade against the nude and the female model reached a fever pitch. In this moment, morality became the grounds for competing claims about the status of the nude. On the one hand, social purity activists fervently denounced artistic nudes displayed by the Royal Academy, arguing that the nude exploited working-class women who served as models and exercised a demoralising influence on its male viewers. On the other hand, artists defended the nude on the basis of classicist aesthetics, arguing that art and beauty superseded morality.

The social purity crusade against the nude in the 1880s had two main aims: first, to curb the profligacy and degeneration of English men, particularly aristocratic and middle-class men, by eliminating nudity in art, which was perceived as an inflammatory instigator of immoral behaviour. And second, to rescue the artist's model from the corrupting clutches of such profligate and degenerate men. The public debates about morality, art, and the artist's model came to a head in 1885, when the association between the female model and the prostitute became the grounds for interventions by social purity activists in the realm of art. The Times printed letters to the editor lamenting the low wages of the artist's model and the display of her naked body in public venues. The catalyst for widespread controversy over the exhibition of the nude was a 20 May letter to the Times penned by J.C. Horsley, treasurer of the Royal Academy, under the signature "A British Matron" ("A Woman's Plea" 10). Identifying the display of nudes at the Academy and Grosvenor galleries as the occasion for his letter, he accused artists of filling British galleries with immoral paintings, lauded the efforts of the social purity movement to curb such productions, and went so far as to advocate the boycotting of

galleries. Subsequent correspondents like "Another British Matron" ("Nude Studies," 23 May 1885: 16) "Another British Parent" ("Nude Studies," 25 May 1885: 10) and "Clericus" ("Woman's Plea," 21 May 1885: 6) concurred. Indeed, recommended "Another British Parent," given the preponderance of nude studies submitted to the Royal Academy, that august institution might consider opening a "chamber of artistic horrors" ("Nude Studies" 25 May 1885: 10) for which an additional sixpence entry fee could be charged. Other correspondents pointed out the inconsistencies in the "British Matron"'s initial argument. And artists like John Brett ("Nude Studies," 22 May 1885: 5) and Edward Poynter ("Nude Studies," 28 May 1885: 4) responded in print, defending the honour of their profession and the reputation of the artist's model. That the Times was inundated with correspondence about the controversy was indicated by a brief notice printed under Poynter's final letter on May 28th that read simply, "We cannot publish any more letters on this subject" ("Nude Studies," 28 May 1885: 4).

This series of correspondence is interesting in relation to the position and representation of the artist's model because of how it conjoins artist's models, viewers, and artists in a heated debate about respectability. In response to an "English Girl" who denounced Horsley's "British Matron" letter, "Senex" wrote to the Times that "such simple representations as the 'British Matron' protests against" (the nude, in other words) "are mute yet speaking evidences of the sad fate of other English girls—once as innocent and modest as they are—whom hunger and want have driven to one of two courses, each equally humiliating if not quite equally deplorable" ("Nude Studies," 22 May 1885: 5). The correspondent is of course talking about modeling and prostitution. Another correspondent noted that "the occupation of a model can hardly be conducive to modesty

or self-respect" ("Nude Studies," 23 May 1885: 16). Months after the initial controversy, artist Edwin Long wrote to the Times, "I have had a pretty large acquaintance with models, and may truly say I have never met with any instance of impropriety among them. [...] The character of these girls is not only irreproachable, but I think Mr. Horsley would be very much astonished to find them so well-mannered and intelligent" ("Models," 13 Oct. 1885: 6).

Edwin Long was not alone in his defence of the models' moral rectitude, nor was the Times alone in its coverage of the controversy over the nude occasioned by Horsley's letter. The Pall Mall Gazette also ran coverage of and letters to the editor about what it termed the "Nudity Shows" at London galleries. Only a May 27 correspondent writing under the name "A Woman of the Nineteenth Century" invoked the artist's model, however, in this instance to argue for a contemporary art that could, following Ruskin, "idealize the life" of its own time. In her letter, the accurate representation of "the tragedy" of the artist's model would constitute "true" art. As she remarks,

> the young girl model brought for the first time to the academy class, realizing for the first time how her beauty is to earn her bread there, and shrinking under the eager gaze of the students crowding their easels around her from letting fall the last poor rag of clothing with which will go her last saving sense of modesty and womanhood. Let the artist who can feel that tragedy and paint it as he feels it hang his picture beside the most exquisite nudities in the exhibition, and the result will prove which is the true and which the conventional art. ("Mr. Ruskin," 27 May 1885: 4)

Despite the ideological distance between this correspondent's advocacy of the nude in art to morally uplifting ends and the social purity crusaders' denigration of the nude for its deleterious moral effects, the artist's model similarly served in both cases as fodder for a broader argument about morality and aesthetics. It was not the material conditions of the artist model's labour that were foregrounded by either artists or social purity crusaders. Instead the model functioned as the grounds on which moral and aesthetic claims to authority were staked.

This mobilization of the figure of the artist's model by both social purity crusaders and artists suggests the contradictory narratives that circulated about the artist's model in the late-Victorian period. On the one hand, social purity crusaders lamented her position as a victim and a fallen woman. On the other hand, artists celebrated her role as muse and inspiration.[5] I want to turn now to a series of articles in the Pall Mall Gazette in the fall of 1885 where, I suggest, these contradictory narratives about the artist's model found their most explicit representation. At this moment, the paper simultaneously published extensive coverage of the "New Crusade" for social purity and a three-part series titled "Models and Morals," which used features of the New Journalism like testimonials and interviews to buttress the position of artists who used models in their studios.

Before doing so, however, I want briefly to outline the contours of a controversy that erupted in July 1885 in the pages of the Pall Mall Gazette, between the May debates about the nudes at the Royal Academy and the October series on "Models and Morals." I am referring to British journalist W.T. Stead's famous exposé of child prostitution and the so-called white slave trade in London, "The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon."[6] Stead's exposé is pertinent to arguments about the artist's model because in accounts

circulated by reformers, stories of "working-class girls 'seduced' into modeling out of sheer financial desperation" (Smith 221) resembled Stead's coverage of the ostensible traffic in young girls in his "Maiden Tribute to Modern Babylon" series. And yet the series on "Models and Morals" tried to distance models from this discourse of prostitution.

On 4 July 1885, then-editor Stead issued a "frank warning" to readers, advising them that the Pall Mall Gazette would publish in four instalments between July 6 and 12 a report submitted by "a Special and Secret Commission of Inquiry" into the subject of "sexual criminality" and child prostitution in London. Stead avowed that "the story of an actual pilgrimage into a real hell is not pleasant reading, and is not meant to be" and warned that "all those who are squeamish, and all those who are prudish, and all those who prefer to live in a fools' paradise of imaginary innocence and purity, selfishly oblivious of the horrible realities which torment those whose lives are passed in the London Inferno, will do well not to read the Pall Mall Gazette of Monday and the three following days" "Notice," 4 July 1885: 1). Of course this enticing rhetoric in tandem with the sensational content of the series served to increase readership. By the time the Pall Mall Gazette issued the Maiden Tribute's third instalment on July 8, bookseller W.H. Smith had banned the sale of the paper in its railway bookstalls for reasons of content. But the paper was so in demand that street vendors were selling out of copies, copies which they were flogging for anywhere from tuppence to a shilling, despite the paper's market price of a penny. Stead continued to draw readers' attention to this popularity even after the series' conclusion. He regularly published a notice called "The 'Pall Mall Gazette' and the Public," in which he commented on the railway bookstall banning and

on sales figures.[7] Although the series sold out immediately, he later re-issued it and eventually published a volume, advertised in October issues, called "The Eliza Armstrong Case."[8]

By this time in October Stead was touring the country as part of what he termed the "New Crusade" for social purity and, more pragmatically, to raise funds for his legal defense.[9] Because "the Maiden Tribute" consisted primarily of Stead's account of procuring a thirteen-year-old virgin, which he claimed to have done in order to prove how simple it was to "purchase" a child in London, he had been charged with kidnapping. Eventually found guilty, he served two months in Holloway prison. But in October 1885, Stead's provincial consciousness- and fund-raising tour was in full swing and lists of donors to his legal defense fund were regularly published in the paper.[10]

At the same time, between 9 and 13 October, the Pall Mall Gazette published a three-part series titled "Models and Morals." This was a series of interviews with and articles by Royal Academicians like G.F. Watts, Thomas Woolner, William Thornycroft and Frank Dicksee, and prominent English artists like Walter Crane. It was also an explicit response to a paper on the relation between art and morality by J.C. Horsley, a.k.a. the "British Matron" of the nude controversy in the Times. In the series, all the artists agreed that drawing from the figure was absolutely crucial to the production of first-class art. To ban the nude, argued Watts, would be "to emasculate art" ("Models and Morals. I" 9 Oct. 1885: 4). They also went to some lengths to disavow any connections between the artist's model and connotations of sexual impropriety, insisting that sitting for a nude was not degrading to the models who were generally of "irreproachable character" and that it need not impede "eventually [marrying] respectably and [bringing]

up respectable families" ("Models and Morals. I" 9 Oct. 1885: 4). There were, however, some inconsistencies in their assertions. While posing for the nude was not debasing to the chaste model, it would seem that it was, in fact, a dangerous occupation for "that class of fallen women" ("Models and Morals. I" 9 Oct. 1885: 4) with whom contact was additionally debasing for the artist. No, Dicksee asserted, "there is nothing immoral in it," but he certainly didn't consider it an "honourable profession" nor should he like "any relative of mine or any one I took an interest in to adopt it" ("Models and Morals. II" 10 Oct. 1885: 2). And Walter Crane, as an active Socialist perhaps the most liberal-minded of the bunch, recommended that critics like Horsley preoccupy themselves instead with "the conditions of existence of vast multitudes of our underpaid and underfed and badly housed working people" ("Models and Morals. III" 13 Oct. 1885: 6).

At a moment when artist's models were making on average a shilling an hour for often physically demanding work, it is noteworthy that Crane exempted models from the ranks of working people. Artists and social purity activists had been arguing vehemently for years with one another and among themselves about the relationship between morality and art: Did art have a moral imperative or responsibility? Did art exist outside the realm of morality? But in this moment, artists did not throw into question the terms of morality in which social purity activists framed the debate about the artist's model. They defended the artist's model's chastity, while social purity activists cast her as an unwitting temptress. As art historian Alison Smith has remarked of the debate, "If anything, the controversy of 1885 reinforced existing stereotypes of the model as muse and innocent victim, while little was done to improve her status or establish conditions of pay and employment" (Smith 235).

Fictional representations similarly construed morality as the focus of controversy and represented the model as a means to further the artist's professional progress. George Moore's first novel, A Modern Lover, published in June 1883 by William Tinsley, is a case in point. It is the story of the rise to fame and fortune of a mediocre painter named Lewis Seymour, who exploits each of the three women who love him in order to achieve success. As a starving artist at the novel's start, he accepts a commission for a triptych of Venus rising from the waves, but is downtrodden when he can't get the features right. Desperate to complete the painting but without the means to pay a model to sit, he convinces his boarding-house neighbour Gwynnie Lloyd to pose nude for him, promising to marry her. To Gwynnie's horror, the finished painting is an accurate representation of both her body and face. Deeply ashamed, she flees the boarding-house and severs all contact with Lewis. Lewis goes on to become a famous and wealthy portrait artist, but sacrifices his avant-garde aesthetic ideals in the process.

Reviewers in the major monthlies generally agreed that Moore had talent as a writer, if only he would abandon his "inclination towards naturalist literature and impressionist art" (Athenaeum qtd. in Frazier 92). Despite these promising reviews, the circulating libraries had not taken enough copies even to sell the novel's print run. Moore was infuriated to learn that W.H.Smith had banned the book after the complaints of two readers who were horrified by the scene of Gwynnie's nude modeling. In the Pall Mall Gazette, Moore recorded his outrage under the title "A New Censorship of Literature." He recounts how he stormed into the circulating library's offices, demanding an explanation for their stocking only fifty copies of the novel. The proprietor explains, "'Your book . . . was considered immoral. Two ladies from the country wrote to me

objecting to that scene where the girl sat to the artist as a model for Venus. After that I naturally refused to circulate your book, unless any customer said he wanted particularly to read Mr. Moore's novel'" (Moore, "New" 2). What follows is a hostile exchange in which Moore remarks the lauding of his literary morals by the important journals, and presses Smith to define for him the parameters of moral decency so that he can avoid the banning of his next book. Smith maintains an insistent recourse to the "'advice'" of his "'customers'" (Moore, "New" 2).

At a moment when critics and writers were hotly debating the aesthetic and moral implications of realism versus romance, Moore perceived the power of the circulating libraries to determine the content and structure of fiction as more detrimental to the future of fiction than this potentially divisive debate. "The literary battle of our time lies not between the romantic and realistic schools of fiction," he declared, "but for freedom from the illiterate censorship of a librarian" (Moore, "New" 2). His representation of Gwynnie as artist's model became the grounds for Smith's censorship of the novel, and Moore's public retaliation. As the complaints of the lady "customers" in the country and Moore's responses suggest, the question of the *morality* of Gwynnie as artist's model was central to this debate.

To provide a sense of what the uproar was about, I cite Moore's representation of nudity in its entirety: "Bravely she threw her shawl away, and showed her arms and bosom. Then there was a pause. She held her skirts irresolutely about her, until at last, with a supreme effort, she threw them aside" (Moore, Modern Lover 45). Smith's lady customers clearly perceived *any* representation of nudity to constitute a breach of morality. Moore, however, like his favourable reviewers, insisted that his representation

was moral because Gwynnie expresses contrition. In the aftermath of her modeling, she is ashamed and cannot bring herself to make good on Lewis's promise to marry her. For Moore, Gwynnie's shame functions as a sign of her virtue. As Lewis paints during the six hours that Gwynnie poses for him, he contemplates the work and morality of artists' models more generally: "The morality of the question interested him profoundly. How different girls were! To think that there are thousands who do the very same thing every day of their lives for one-and-sixpence an hour, and some of them quite good girls" (Moore, Modern Lover 48-9).

The Heyday of the Artist's Model

Whereas Gwynnie Lloyd is an amateur, unpaid model who poses nude to save her beloved because he has threatened suicide, George Du Maurier's Trilby is an altogether different sort of model. But she is not, I want to show, an altogether different sort of woman. When the story opens, Trilby is a sweet lass beloved by the three English artists who share a Paris studio. They soon discover, though, that Trilby has, in her past, sat in the "altogether." That is, she has modelled nude. And not only that; she also admits, albeit vaguely, to having had sexual relations with at least one artist in the past. It is not her humble origins that her beloved Little Billee and his mother cannot overcome, but rather her status as a nude model. As Mrs Bagot remarks, it matters what *sort* of model Trilby has been. "There are models and models, of course" (Du Maurier, Trilby 143).

Despite her socially dubious profession, Trilby manages to transcend the moral taint of modeling, if not in Mrs Bagot's eyes then at least in terms of the novel's broader narrative. Although "she had all the virtues but one" (Du Maurier, Trilby 40), the narrator makes clear that Trilby's nude modeling has not compromised her innocence even if it

has compromised her social status. We are told that "she might almost be said to possess a virginal heart" (Du Maurier, Trilby 42). She possesses a kind of prelapsarian innocence that the narrator construes as heroic by comparing her to Lady Godiva. That "she could be naked and unashamed -- in this respect an absolute savage" (Du Maurier, Trilby 77) is represented as an attribute rather than a fault. Taffy, Sandy, and Little Billee treat Trilby with only the utmost respect. Indeed, "had she been Little Billee's sister she could not have been treated with more real respect" (Du Maurier, Trilby 73).

The narrator's description of Trilby's lack of shame precedes a lengthy contribution to the debate on the nude, which Du Maurier explicitly identifies as a "digression" (Du Maurier, Trilby 80). Here Du Maurier weighs in as an author who is first and foremost an artist by training. Like the artists who responded to Horsley's "British Matron" letter by defending the morality of the artist's model, he insists that "nothing is so chaste as nudity" (Du Maurier, Trilby 77). The topicality of Du Maurier's diatribe on Trilby's chastity was not lost on readers for whom the figure of the artist's model became an object of interest. As Punch illustrator Harry Furniss later recounted in Victorian Women: Good, Bad, and Indifferent, after the publication of Trilby, society women became fascinated with the figure of the artist's model.

Perhaps less directly a response to Du Maurier's novel than to the public fascination with depictions of Bohemian life were the productions of musical comedies centered around the figure of the artist's model. In February 1895, An Artist's Model made its debut at Daly's Theatre in London.[11] Lyricist Harry Greenbank and composer Sidney Jones had previously collaborated on A Gaiety Girl, one of a number of successful musical comedies of the day that assumed as their heroine the "girl." As Peter Bailey

notes in "Musical comedy and the rhetoric of the girl, 1892-1914," A Gaiety Girl was "the first work to be termed 'musical comedy', and the definitive hit of the new form" (Bailey, Popular Culture 176). The production celebrated the advent of the modern chorus girl and located her specifically in the Gaiety Theatre, which became synonymous with musical theatre in the mid-1890s. In musical comedies like The Shop Girl, The Girl Behind the Counter, and The Sunshine Girl, the eponymous heroine inevitably transcended her working-class origins to marry up the social ladder.

An Artist's Model followed this generically tried and true formula, but achieved less success. Reviewers in the Times and the Athenaeum concurred that the production "on the first evening ran some risk of shipwreck" ("Dramatic Gossip" 193), largely because of the poor quality of the dialogue between songs.[12] Pertinent to my discussion here, however, is the representation of the artist's model of the title and of the other characters' attitudes towards models in general. Adele is a former artist's model, currently a rich widow. She "returns to the studio with the object of recovering the affections" of Rudolph, an art student who happens to share his name with the hero of Henri Mürger's stories of French Bohemian life upon which Puccini would base his opera La Bohème in 1896. Misunderstanding ensues, and Adele becomes engaged to an English nobleman before the denouement in which she and Rudolph overcome all obstacles and are united. Adele's position as a wealthy widow suggests the class mobility of the artist's model I have been talking about. This mobility is reinforced by other models in the studio, who sing to the artists as a chorus,

> Though at present we're models unwedded,
>
> If the future to fortune should carry you,

With our characters sober'd and steadied,

We shall all be delighted to marry you. (Hall 1)

In the opening song, the characters all sing together of the various constituencies of their community, including "Artists who paint from the naughty and nudey O" and "Innocent models and models with histories" (Hall 1).

In the mythology of the artist's studio that circulates in the 1890s, the artist's model, whether innocent or historied, is a key figure in the consolidation of artistic genius as a bastion of male privilege. Artists publicly defended the respectability of artist's models in part because it insured their *own* respectability and professionalism. And yet in popular representations, the artist's model lent a certain sexual cachet to the artist's studio and buttressed the masculinity of the artist. I want to suggest that the artist's model in popular representations may have functioned thus at a moment when women's incursions into the profession of art as artists rather than models threatened conventional ideas about femininity and artistic genius. If, as Frances Borzello has argued, "it is Bohemia that turned models into women" (Borzello 86), it is also this *fin de siècle* Bohemia of Du Maurier and Greenbank that transformed the mundane work of modeling into a glamorous profession that held out the promise of class mobility. But in these representations and in late-Victorian debates about morality and art, it is the work of the artist's model, and not her sexuality, that is ultimately subject to censorship. It is perhaps the work of the Association of Artists' Models, established around 1920, and model's memoirs, like that of Café Royal regular Betty May published in 1929, to make visible the conditions under which the late-Victorian artist's model laboured and made possible the seemingly implausible identification of artists as "eminent bohemians."

[1] See Ardis; Pykett, Title; Miller; Showalter.

[2] Leonée Ormond provides a comprehensive narrative of the personal and legal ramifications occasioned by the Joe Sibley caricature and Whistler's response to it in her biography of Du Maurier. See "'Joe Sibley,'" 462-79. She notes that Whistler's previous portrayal of Du Maurier in his volume The Gentle Art of Making Enemies (1890), in which he made some witty remarks at Du Maurier's expense, may have provoked the caricature in Trilby. In a 7 June 1894 to McIlvaine, Harpers' representative in London, Du Maurier confirms this assessment: "I had meant the whole thing as a joke, a merely playful tit for tat - I never intended any reflexion on his courage, which I never doubted for a moment, whatever other faults he might have. If I had intended to be really malevolent my stars! I would have written something very different & without bringing myself within the reach of a libel action. It is easy to do that!" Harper Collection (MA 1950 65 p. 12o-fo), Pierpont Morgan Library.

[3] There is an exception in Stephens—a portrait of George Adolphus Storey, A.R.A. (89-91)--which includes a model in the photo. Judging from the photo, however, the woman who appears is an upper-class client sitting for her portrait rather than a working model.

[4] For more on the architecture of artists' homes, see Walkley.

[5] In The Female Offender, Cesare Lombroso and William Ferrero identified yet another possible identity for the female artist's model: the criminal. Several of their case studies are artist's models, including "a prostitute-model. . . who killed her lover, a painter" (131), "T.P., aged nineteen, a painter's model" convicted of homicide (303), and a woman imprisoned for killing a painter who, subsequent to her release from jail, took up modeling (306).

[6] For more on Stead's "Maiden Tribute" series, see Devereux; Gorham; and Walkowitz, City of Dreadful Delight.

[7] See, for example, "The 'Pall Mall Gazette' and the Public," Pall Mall Gazette 10 July 1885: 8; and 11 July 1885: 8.

[8] The first advertisement for The Eliza Armstrong Case. With Numerous Illustrations, priced at sixpence, appeared on 19 Oct. 1885, on page 16.

[9] See, for example, "The New Crusade," Pall Mall Gazette 12 Oct. 1885: 8, 12; and 16 Oct. 1885: 11.

[10] The first list of donors to the Defence Fund appeared on 27 Oct. 1885, on page 13. The following caveat prefaced the list of hundreds of donors: "Subscription does not imply approval of all the means adopted by Mr. Stead and his friends, nor any opinion on the merits of the case now before the court, but only a desire to see fair play, and that those persons who have been instrumental in securing a great reform of the law and of public opinion, and who have been actuated by the most virtuous motives, should not be crushed for want of money."

[11] J.P. Wearing's calendar of The London Stage, 1890-99 indicates that Greenbank's and Jones's musical comedy ran at Daly's Theatre from 2 Feb. 1895 to 25 May 1895, at which time it transferred to the Lyric, where it ran from 28 May 1895 to 6 September 1895. It enjoyed a second run at Daly's from 28 September 1895 to 28 March 1896. An Artist's Model also spawned a spoof titled An Artist's Muddle, which ran briefly at the

Novelty Theatre from 7 September 1896 to 12 September 1896. See Wearing 598. Neville Lynn also penned an "enormously successful one-act farce" (n.p.) titled The Artist's Model; or, One at a Time.

[12] See "Daly's Theatre" for the Times review which similarly castigated the dialogue.

Chapter Three
Under the Influence:
Victorian Medicine and Hypnotic Fictions of the *fin de siècle*

In September 1894, the same month that Harper and Brothers launched the book version of Trilby, Margaret E. Sangster puffed the novel in the affiliated Harper's Weekly. In "'Trilby' from a Woman's Point of View," Sangster praised Du Maurier's realistic depictions of character and place, comparing his art favorably alongside that of Balzac and Eliot. "There are people not a few," she predicted, "who will remember the first half of 1894 not for the hard times, or for the strikes, nor the yacht-race, nor any other thing of public interest or private concern, so much as for the pleasure they had in reading Trilby." This popularity Sangster attributed in part to the novel's "rollicking" story, its "tremendous" pace, and its "genial" philosophy. But she also recognized the appeal for readers of the novel's hypnotism theme. "Hypnotism and kindred psychological problems are immensely attractive to most of us," she concluded, "and Du Maurier's use of mesmeric tools is masterly" (Sangster 883).

Mesmerism was not only a subject of fascination for readers and reviewers of Trilby but also became a common metaphor to explain how the novel had achieved such enormous popularity by seizing the reading public's attention. As Daniel Pick has remarked, "London 'lost its head': it was as though the very reception of the book and the play manifested the hypnotic problem described in its plot – readers and viewers falling prey to the same captivation, disorientation and irrationality conveyed on the stage" (22). Almost sixty years after Trilby's publication, Du Maurier's granddaughter, novelist Daphne Du Maurier, remarked on its hypnotic effects:

> . . . Peter Ibbetson and Trilby sounded such an echo in the emotions of the men and women of his [Du Maurier's] day, both in this country and throughout the United State of America, that they were read, and re-read, and thumbed again, year after year, down to our time; and not only read but in some inexplicable fashion, deeply loved. When a novel can affect the human heart in such a way it seems to mean one thing only. Not that the tale is exceptional in itself, but that the writer has so projected his personality on to the printed page that the reader either identifies himself with that personality, or becomes fascinated by it, and in a sense, near hypnotized. (Du Maurier, Introduction xii)

The theme of hypnotism that Du Maurier employed in the book became even more crucial to the official stage adaptation of Trilby. Paul Potter, the author of the stage Trilby, began his adaptation shortly after the novel was initially issued in book form. Potter undertook his project of adaptation in the Boston's Mercantile Library so that he could "dip every now and then into the references [he] was using on hypnotism" (Stetson 237). In May 1895, Potter remarked on his extensive research to a Metropolitan Magazine interviewer and emphasized how his use of hypnotism differentiated his play from Du Maurier's original story:

> ...[D]on't you know that hypnotism is the very essence of the play? There is where my play differs from Du Maurier's book. When I read the book I saw very clearly that the parting of two lovers by hypnotism was the backbone of its drama. You see, hypnotism had never before been used on the stage seriously -- not to my knowledge, that is -- and here was the chance.... I made the hypnotic plot first of

all. . . . I built of that part of it before I did another thing, and strengthened it all around. All that is my own. (Stetson 237-38)

By early 1892, when Du Maurier began work on Trilby, the theme of hypnotism was already popular among writers of fiction. The practices of hypnotism and its antecedent, mesmerism, had aroused writers' interest since the popularization of mesmerism in the 1830s. As Donald Hartman's bibliographic research has shown, hundreds of Victorian novelists drew on the popularity of the subject and the possibilities of exploring the concepts of will, power, and morality that it offered. Many more Victorians participated in mesmeric séances and undertook to study or to subject themselves to the practice of mesmerism, especially in the late 1830s and 1840s when "the mesmeric mania" (qtd. in Kaplan 5) was at its height. Mesmerism "claimed the attention not only of the medical profession and the general public but also that of serious poets, novelists, critics, painters, the upper middle class, and the aristocracy" (Kaplan 26).

Debate about the merits and veracity of mesmerism was widespread beyond the medical profession. Luminaries such as Arnold, the Brownings, the Carlyles, Clough, Dickens, Tennyson, Thackeray, and Trollope all expressed curiosity about mesmerism, Tennyson going so far as to practise it himself. Dickens took a keen interest after an 1838 visit to University College Hospital, where physician and professor John Elliotson was studying the effects of mesmerism on patients suffering from nervous disorders. Fred Kaplan, in Dickens and Mesmerism: The Hidden Springs of Fiction (1975), has admirably documented Dickens's fascination with mesmerism and the ways in which related questions about powers of mind, "the origins. . . of evil and mental disease"

(Kaplan 107), and "why. . . certain individuals [are] able to influence, even to dominate, others for good and often for evil" (Kaplan 107) found their way into his fiction. Another example of mesmerism's appeal was expressed by Harriet Martineau, who recorded her "cure" from prolonged illness by mesmerism in an 1844 series of letters to the Athenaeum which caused a sensation. Her efforts "to lift up the subject [of mesmerism] out of the dirt into which it had been plunged, and to place it on a scientific ground" (Martineau 196) were thwarted by the editors who appended a sceptical commentary to the last of the six letters; controversy over her letters and mesmerism's therapeutic capacities continued in the journal well after the letters' publication.[1]

Even after the medical community lost interest in mesmerism in the late 1840s, the lay public continued to enjoy it as a popular entertainment and writers continued to employ mesmerism as a plot device and a way of exploring power relations between characters. In Jane Eyre (1847), for example, Jane's stint as a teacher with St. John Rivers comes to an abrupt end when, one night, she hears Rochester beckon her across time and space, "Jane! Jane! Jane!" (444). Jane's clairvoyant perception of Rochester's voice is a singular aberrance in a narrative that, as Kate Lawson has recently suggested, otherwise adheres to a realist, even positivist, aesthetic. Although this scene does not involve a conventional representation of mesmerism, its depiction of Jane's clairvoyance nonetheless evokes contemporary debates about powers of mind in which mesmerism was implicated. In Villette (1853), the narrator, Lucy Snowe, alludes to the "influence, mesmeric or otherwise—an influence unwelcome, displeasing, but effective" of Monsieur Paul, who possesses the ability to penetrate "[her] thought and read [her] wish to shun him" (299). Charlotte Brontë's interest in and representations of powers of the

mind, piqued after Martineau's revelations in the Athenaeum, were shared by other Victorian writers. The Brownings could not concur on the value of mesmerism; while Elizabeth Barrett Browning believed in the possibilities of communication proffered by spiritualism and mesmerism, Robert Browning thought it bunk. His poem "Mr. Sludge the Medium" makes clear his disdain for charlatans who would defraud naïve believers by means of practices like mesmerism. And in an 1883 Longman's column, critic Andrew Lang invoked a variety of fictional characters and real historical figures to describe "a Stranger" who was "an accomplished mesmerist": "He resembled Mr. Isaacs, Zanoni (in the novel of that name), Mendoza (in 'Codlingsby'), the soul-less man in 'A Strange Story,' Mr. Home, Mr. Irving Bishop, a Buddhist adept in the astral body, and most other mysterious characters of history and fiction" (518). Of course Lang uses these references ironically to suggest the dire badness of the character he describes, but they do indicate the familiarity Lang expected from his readers with the figure of the evil mesmerist. They also indicate the increasingly ineluctable association between the figures of "the Stranger" and "the mesmerist" by the early 1880s.

Daniel Pick has recently devoted a book to the analysis of this phenomenon. Titled Svengali's Web: The Alien Enchanter in Modern Culture (2000), the book proposes "to explain Svengali and company's massive cultural appeal" (43) by exploring the interconnections among late Victorian understandings of "the nature of unconscious influence" (3), sexuality, and race. Whereas Pick usefully compares Trilby's emergence as a famous diva under the powerful influence of Svengali to cultural precedents such as Jenny Lind's remarkable popularity, I am primarily concerned in this chapter to explore

debates in the medical community about Svengali specifically and the hypnotist figure more generally.

In my early research on Trilby's reception, I was interested to discover a response to the novel by Ernest Hart, a prominent London medical man and then-editor of the British Medical Journal. In the second edition of Hart's Mesmerism, Hypnotism, and the New Witchcraft (1896), a revised version of his initial 1893 publication, Hart included an "Appendix on 'Trilby.'" This critical assessment of both Du Maurier's novel and Potter's stage adaptation suggested that such fictional representations of hypnotism were of interest to the medical community at this moment. But, I wondered, why would the medical community bother debating the value of a creative rendering of hypnotism at all? This chapter responds to this question by using the reception of Trilby as an occasion to explore medical debates about the value and function of hypnotism in the late Victorian period.

In order adequately to situate these debates, I begin with an overview of the history of hypnotism in the nineteenth century and its relationship to the late eighteenth-century practice of mesmerism, which was imported to Great Britain from the Continent. The similarities and differences between these two practices are important because hypnotism constantly risked association with the popular cultural connotations of mesmerism. This overview provides a necessary context for my discussion of debates about hypnotism conducted within the medical community, as they are represented on the pages of the British Medical Journal. I explore why Trilby, in particular, became the focus of medical critique and go on to compare Du Maurier's novel to a raft of other late-Victorian fictions in which the hypnotist figures prominently. I then trace the generic contours of these

novels, mapping the conventions of a sub-genre of novels that I term "hypnotic fictions," after Arthur Quiller-Couch's use of the same term in his review of Trilby.

With the exceptions of Kaplan, Pick, and Martha Tatar, whose important Spellbound: Studies on Mesmerism and Literature (1978) concentrates on European and American contexts, little literary criticism has been written on the subjects of mesmerism or hypnotism and Victorian literature. This is gradually changing. Catherine Wynne and Martin Willis, for example, recently proposed a collection of essays on the topic of "Mesmerism and Literature in the Nineteenth Century." And Victorian Review (26.1, 2000) recently featured an entire issue devoted to "Weird Science," which included a piece by Catherine Wynne on mesmerism in Bram Stoker's fiction. If literary critics have been slow to assess the impact of fringe scientific practices like mesmerism on literary production, this is perhaps because historians of science have only recently begun to turn their attentions to this fascinating area of research. Since the publication of On the Margins of Science: The Social Construction of Rejected Knowledge (1979), however, the field has burgeoned. Earlier work by Alan Gauld, Terry Parssinen, and John Palfreman on mesmerism specifically has been complemented by the publication of the first monograph on the subject, Alison Winter's brilliant cultural history of mesmerism in Great Britain. Although the relationship between nineteenth-century science and literature has been the subject of an emerging field of interdisciplinary studies at least since the publication of Gillian Beer's Darwin's Plots (1983, recently re-issued with a new introduction), literary critics have tended to focus on the nineteenth-century scientific disciplines of biology (Beer), psychology (Jenny Bourne Taylor), and botany (Ann Shteir) as the most fruitful avenues of investigation. This chapter expands this

literary critical emphasis to include mesmerism and hypnotism, and shares with critics like Beer, Taylor, and Shteir the critical impetus of explaining how literature assimilated, represented, and challenged contemporary science.

The History of Hypnotism

The history of hypnotism in Britain is inseparable from the histories of a constellation of practices that similarly provoked debates about the boundaries around science, including animal magnetism (or mesmerism, as it became known), phrenology, homeopathy, and spiritualism.[2] In the popular imagination, though, mesmerism was often regarded as the antecedent of hypnotism. Indeed, medical opponents of hypnotism at the end of the nineteenth century often strategically conflated the two practices in order to discredit hypnotism.

Mesmerism took its name from its creator, Franz Anton Mesmer, who posited the existence of a universal fluid that could be manipulated to enhance health. If the fluid that filled human nerves was the same as the fluid that filled the void of the universe, Mesmer argued, then human bodies could influence not only one another but also their environment. Convinced that magnets were especially good conductors of this fluid, he called this phenomenon "animal magnetism." Scorned by the medical community in Vienna in the late 1770s, Mesmer set up shop in Paris, where people packed his salon to be cured of their ills. Followers sat around large oaken tubs filled with magnetized water from which iron and glass rods protruded. They grasped the rods, held hands, and believed that emanations from the rods were stimulating the healing circulation of magnetic fluid in their bodies.

Although animal magnetism enjoyed limited popularity in Great Britain in the late eighteenth century, it wasn't until the 1830s that interest in the subject took off. By this point, the grand props of Mesmer's salon like the huge oaken tubs and the rods were generally absent from the scene of mesmerism. Mesmerists were inducing the healing trance merely by passing their hands over their subjects' bodies, which meant that the practice could be taken to the people rather than requiring them to come to it. Itinerant mesmerists spread across the country, demonstrating their powers in public shows and "jockey[ing] with skeptics and competitors for the audience's trust" (Winter 5). British medical doctors began to explore the significance of the trance for surgical purposes, discovering that patients could undergo surgery without experiencing much or any pain while mesmerized. As Alison Winter has so brilliantly shown in Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain (1998), hypnotism was poised to revolutionize surgical procedure in the late 1840s until its promise as an anaesthetic was abandoned with the advent of chemical anaesthesias, first ether and then chloroform.

From its development in the early 1840s, hypnotism was implicated in questions about the relationship between scientific and lay knowledges. Surgeon James Braid developed a theory and practice of hypnotism in the early 1840s in an effort to distinguish it from mesmerism, which he actively disparaged. Braid inherited the term "hypnotic," already in use to denote a soporific, and shifted the emphasis from the drug to the state of "nervous sleep" which it induced.[3] His aim in inducing such sleep was mainly therapeutic. He hoped "to increase or diminish blood supply either generally or to particular organs or parts of the body" (Gauld 285) in an effort to alleviate symptoms of physical distress in patients. Braid altered mesmerism by eliminating three important

concepts integral to it: the idea of magnetic fluids associated with mesmerism, the sexual connotations of the physical "passes" performed by the mesmerist on his subject, and the suggestion that the mesmerist imposed his body, mind, or will on the subject (Winter 185). Despite Braid's efforts to professionalize the practice of hypnotism by differentiating between it and mesmerism, however, the two terms were often conflated by skeptics within the medical community who doubted its efficacy and in the popular imagination.[4] The association of hypnotism with mesmerism by medical men was strategic; it undermined the construction of hypnotism as a legitimate field of scientific study by affiliating it with a practice that was the subject of heated debate within the mainstream medical community. Braid's concept of hypnotism did not go unassailed by either mesmerists or its detractors. He was attacked by Thomas Wakley, prominent surgeon and editor of the preeminent British medical journal The Lancet, and incurred the private wrath of John Elliotson, the medical community's foremost advocate of mesmerism.[5]

As Braid's relations to Wakley and Elliotson suggest, mesmerism and hypnotism were not always fringe practices and theories that existed beyond the pale of mainstream medicine. Rather, they developed in relation to a medical profession that was itself attempting to accrue an authority which has now become naturalized for us.[6] The structure of the profession we are today familiar with -- general practitioners, on the one hand, and specialists associated with hospitals, on the other -- only emerged during the course of the nineteenth century from an older corporate model based on the hierarchy of physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries licensed by the appropriate College or Society. The medical reform movement, of which Wakley was an outspoken proponent,

challenged this corporate system in which medical practitioners were besieged by unqualified "quacks" who were unimpeded by governing regulations. The profession was also divided along regional lines. To provincial general practitioners, men who practised both medicine and surgery whether they were dually licensed or not, corporate alignments were less important than to the London elite.[7] This "division between the prestigious and influential men at the top of the profession and the ordinary practitioners" (Peterson, Profession 25) was to dog efforts to unify the emerging profession until 1886, when the Medical Act Amendment Act both integrated medicine and surgery and integrated GPs into the institutional structure of the profession.

Although the initial Medical Act of 1858 sought to define the medical qualifications required for legitimate practitioners and to provide clear institutional organization for the medical profession, "Victorian society in 1858 had limited confidence in the power of medical 'science' and serious reservations about medical men's social authority and prestige" (Peterson, Profession 38). Despite the push for medical reform from within the ranks of the profession, this legislation preserved the power of the London elite in matters of education and licensing, and preserved the priority accorded to social advantage over skill in career advancement for medical men. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the evolution of medical education—from an apprenticeship model to an emphasis on training provided in medical school—facilitated a shift in the "sense of identity and the locus of power in the world of medicine" (Peterson, Profession 157). The reforms of the mid-Victorian period inaugurated "important changes in the authoritative status of the sciences and medicine" (Winter 300). In the last few decades of the nineteenth century, the medical profession

consolidated its political power, its cultural authority, and its numbers.[8] Finally, in the 1880s, "medical men claimed—and the lay world began to accept—their right to power based on their special knowledge" (Peterson, Profession 187).

Hypnotism enjoyed popularity as a public entertainment and therapeutic, but fell out of favour as a subject of interest to the medical profession in the 1860s. A correspondent in the BMJ explained its decline in medical circles thus:

> Its then popularity was largely due to the unsparing use which had been made of its influence in the drama and romances of the day. Probably, owing to its unscientific and inaccurate employment by authors, and its more glaring caricature by itinerant exhibitors, many, if not most, of whom were thorough-paced impostors, it was promptly dropped by men of science, who were naturally reluctant to associate themselves with such questionable surroundings." ("Mesmerism" 654)

Of course the correspondent's retrospective of the history of hypnotism is coloured by the narrative of scientific progress he propounds. But from a late twentieth-century perspective, as Alan Gauld has argued, hypnotism played an important role in the development of psychology as a legitimate field of science and as an avenue for treatment in psychiatric care.[9] By the middle of the nineteenth century, "the psyche was almost squeezed out of psychiatry" (Gauld 297). Under the reign of medical and scientific materialism, the hospital, the clinic, and the autopsy table became the locations for investigation. Doctors like Cesar Lombroso and Henry Maudsley approached psychiatry from an organicist perspective, often perceiving mental abnormality as a form of hereditary degeneration. By the late 1880s, however, the term "psychotherapy" was in

currency to denote the treatment of disease by psychological methods. From 1880 to the end of the century, the concepts of psychotherapy and psychological causes of mental disorders gained ground. The gradual acceptance of such concepts is thus attributable, in part, to the hypnotic movement which attracted attention in medical circles, beginning in the late 1870s when experiments by French neurologist and physician Jean-Martin Charcot at the Salpêtrière Hospital in Paris began to attract the attention of the international medical community.

On 13 February 1882, Charcot delivered a paper to the French Academy of Sciences, summarizing the results of the hypnotism experiments he had been conducting since 1878. By 1882 Charcot was already a revered "grand maître" (Harris, Introduction xii) of the medical profession and the recently appointed Professor of Diseases of the Nervous System at the Academy of Medicine. He had spent twenty years as the head of the prestigious Salpêtrière hospital in Paris and would gain further renown posthumously as a formative influence on his most famous student, Sigmund Freud. It is perhaps surprising to us, then, that a doctor of Charcot's stature should publicly and unabashedly avow his interest in hypnotism. As historian Ruth Harris explains, even "neurologists who esteem [Charcot's] great clinical contributions in the neurosciences tend to write in embarrassed tones about 'unscientific' forays into the realms of hysteria and hypnotism, characterizing this work as the less successful element of an otherwise impressive *oeuvre*" (Harris, Introduction ix).

In 1882, however, the relationship between hypnotism and science was less clear than these late twentieth-century neurologists suggest. The subject of hypnotism, long popular among the lay public but dormant in medical circles for decades, became once

again a source of heated debate among medical men in Europe and Great Britain. After decades of the neglect of hypnotism by the medical profession, the serious investigations by Charcot and his pupils at the Salpêtrière hospital in Paris finally consecrated the study of hypnotic phenomena as a legitimate area of scientific research. According to his colleague Pierre Janet, Charcot's avowed interest in such experiments prompted a deluge of publications on the subject of hypnotism: "'It was as if [Charcot] had broken down a dam behind which a vast head of water had been accumulating . . . . Everywhere, 'hypnosis redivivus'. . . gave rise to numberless books and articles'" (qtd. in Gauld 311). Hypnotism thus became the topic *du jour* in the medical press, where medical men argued about its scientific value and who was authorized to perform it.

Much controversy was generated in the British Medical Journal (BMJ), which played a crucial role in the contest over the credibility of hypnotism. As the official organ of the British Medical Association, the BMJ was a venue in which medical practitioners argued about their collective identity and the future of their profession. At a moment when neither a cohesive medical community nor future prospects could be taken for granted, hypnotism became a controversial subject that brought to the fore the very questions of professional identity and authority. The articles, addresses, letters to the editor, and inquiries about hypnotism which the BMJ printed offer a means of addressing the following questions, which structure the rest of this chapter: What was at stake in the public representation of hypnotism in the 1880s and 90s in the medical press, on the one hand, and in mainstream journalism, fiction, and theatricals, on the other hand? What were the grounds for the defence of or the scepticism about hypnotism within the medical

community? And why did the representation of hypnotism in literature and the theatre become a focus of medical critique in the 1890s?

In order to respond to these questions, I analyse the writing on hypnotism in the BMJ from 1878, when Charcot undertook his experiments on hypnotism, to 1898, when the death of editor Ernest Hart ended the campaign against hypnotism which he spearheaded in the pages of the BMJ. I focus on three aspects of this writing in particular: the consideration of foreign practices of hypnotism; the debate between hypnotism as a therapeutic, on the one hand, and as an anaesthetic, on the other; and the analogies drawn between hypnotism and quackery. The BMJ is worth examining in detail on the issue of hypnotism because both Trilby and cultural reproductions of Du Maurier's novel excited commentary in the Journal. Terry M. Parssinen has argued that hypnotism was accepted as "medically respectable" in the 1890s because it was no longer "associated with a dangerous popular culture phenomenon as mesmerism had been" (117). Hart's 1893 series of articles on "the new mesmerism" in the BMJ suggests, however, that the figure of the hypnotist *was* fraught with popular connotations that rendered it a risky position for medical men to assume in the mid-1890s.

"Medical" Hypnotism

In 1887, Vizetelly and Company published Dr. Phillips: A Maida Vale Idyll by Julia Frankau, writing under the pseudonym Frank Danby.[10] The one-volume novel was, according to Frankau's Times obituary, a "very shrewd and very unpleasant [study] of ill-behaved and disagreeable people" (11). It was also a huge success. The plot turns on an affair between a woman and a Jewish doctor who murders his wife in order to consecrate the relationship with his mistress and their child. Dr. Phillips's wife dies on the operating

table when he interferes with her surgery, but his idyllic future is thwarted because his mistress absconds with a much younger man and his daughter dies. The doctor, however, lives on

> to unsex woman and maim men; to be a living testimony of manual dexterity and moral recklessness. He is the idol of the clinic, the prophet of the new school; his name is in all men's mouths, and he can ably defend himself with pen and tongue against the reproaches and attacks of his more timorous or more conscientious brethren. (341)

The novel caused a sensation, in part because late Victorian readers read it as a *roman à clef*. The character of Dr. Phillips—a clever Jewish doctor, sub-editor of a medical journal, and wife-murderer—resonated for attentive readers with Ernest Hart, successful Jewish doctor and longtime editor of the British Medical Journal, whose wife had died under mysterious circumstances in 1861.[11]

Despite his importance and influence in the Victorian medical world, Hart remains, as M. Jeanne Peterson laments, a "shadowy figure" ("Victorian Periodicals" 38).[12] His medical career began when he was prohibited from pursuing a university career because of religious disabilities.[13] Instead, he obtained a scholarship to study medicine and in 1856 was admitted as a member of the Royal College of Surgeons. He specialised in eye diseases, established a consulting practice in London, and became Ophthalmic Surgeon and Dean of the Medical School at St. Mary's Hospital. In addition to his scientific abilities, Hart was a gifted writer. In March 1854 he published an article on British Jews in Fraser's Magazine, and in 1863 he was engaged by The Lancet (under the editorship of Thomas Wakley) to correct proofs and to assist in their literary department.

In the 1870s he enjoyed a professional relationship with the publishing firm of Smith, Elder and Company, advising George Smith on the publication of medical literature, and editing for the firm both the weekly Sanitary Record and the Medical Record, which "gained repute in medical circles by the copiousness of its reports of foreign medical practice" (DNB Supplement 821).

Hart's most important editorial association, however, was with the British Medical Journal. Hart assumed the editorship of the BMJ in January 1867, at the age of thirty-one.[14] By that point, the BMJ was the official organ of the British Medical Association (BMA). As such, its objectives included the binding together of the Association by "assist[ing] medical men *outside* the London élite to advance their professional status" (Bartrip, Mirror 36) and the recruitment of new Association members. More generally, the BMJ -- along with its primary competitors the Lancet (1823-), the Medical Times and Gazette (1852-85) and the Medical Press and Circular (1866-1961) -- aimed to "help establish medicine as a responsible and reputable profession" (Bartrip, Mirror 36). The BMJ had not always enjoyed a direct association with BMA members. Indeed, it was only in 1857 that it had assumed the title of the BMJ in order to underscore the BMA's "national constituency" (Bartrip, Mirror 33). Until 1857, the journal was known as the Provincial Medical and Surgical Journal (PMSJ), the organ of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association which had been founded in 1832 to give voice to general practitioners disgruntled with the London elite's professional leadership.[15] The PMSJ was first published in October 1840, at the outset of the Victorian medical reform movement which was to dominate the first two decades of the journal's coverage.[16] Although the PMSJ was aimed at a PMSA readership, and was

indeed included as a benefit of membership to Association members, it was initially "launched as an independent commercial speculation, the success of which depended upon sales and advertising revenue" (Bartrip, Mirror 14). In April 1844, however, the PMSJ launched the first number that proclaimed unambiguously the journal's role as an Association organ, at which point "members became far more sensitive about, and critical of" the journal, much more "than they had been towards virtually the same publication when it had gone to PMSA members as a part of their membership and yet was not an Association publication" (Bartrip, Mirror 18).[17] In 1853 the journal's editorship transferred to London, where the PMSJ amalgamated with the London Journal of Medicine to become the Association Medical Journal. This shift in editorial location from the provinces to London figured the greater struggle within the medical profession over the hegemony of London as a site of medical knowledge. The move inaugurated "a kind of civil war between London expansionists and provincial conservatives," a war that was waged over the title of the journal (Bartrip, Mirror 28) Although provincial constituents of the PMSA advocated changing the title back from the Association Medical Journal to the PMSJ, then-editor John Cormack dug in his heels. "'The name 'Provincial' is at all times fatal to the success of any literary undertaking,'" he insisted (qtd. in Bartrip, Mirror 32).[18]

The BMJ under Hart's editorial aegis continued the tradition of promoting the medical profession, but also paid increasing attention to controversial socio-medical issues of national and international importance. Mere provincialism had no place in Hart's BMJ, whose circulation increased from 2500 in 1867 to 20,500 in 1897.[19] After infanticide came to public attention in the 1860s, for example, Hart campaigned in the

BMJ "to identify, track down, and expose individual baby farmers" (Bartrip, Mirror 100) in order to create public indignation and to compel government intervention. The BMJ under Hart also promoted the Contagious Diseases Acts in the 1870s, and Hart's personal support of vivisection and compulsory vaccination found expression in extensive coverage of these issues in the journal. In his history of the BMJ, Peter Bartrip examines these debates in which the Journal participated during Hart's editorial reign.[20] Hypnotism, however, remains an important but overlooked controversy in the annals of the BMJ.

The resurgence of professional medical interest in hypnotism began in the late 1870s. In France and Germany, medical men studied the psychological and physiological effects of hypnotism and its therapeutic potential. Charcot's experiments with hysterical patients led him to posit hypnosis as "a pathological or diseased condition" (Hart, "Schools" 722) which comprised "a series of nervous states" (Hart, "Schools" 721).[21] He studied the affinity between hysteria and hypnosis, arguing that in the hypnotized state the patient manifested the symptoms of hysteria, and defending the value of hypnosis as a therapeutic tool.[22] His position was "largely founded upon the performances of not more than a dozen star subjects, all of whom were hysterical female patients" (Gauld 311). This scientific theory was hotly contested by Hippolyte Bernheim, a professor in the Faculty of Medicine at Nancy, who argued that anyone was susceptible to suggestion. These opposing stances towards hypnotism were reiterated in British debates in which medical men who believed in hypnotic phenomena aligned themselves with either Charcot or Bernheim. The Salpêtrière and the Nancy "schools" became the touchstones

for curious medical practitioners who wrote letters to the editor requesting reference material on hypnotism and for lively debate in the BMJ.

In terms of sheer volume, the debate reached its apotheosis in 1889-90, mirroring the increased publication of medical books, pamphlets, and articles in the periodical press on the subject of hypnotism. But throughout the 1878-98 period, there were recurring concerns. Contributors were very interested in the foreign practice of hypnotism. In articles and heated exchanges about the value of hypnotism as a therapeutic and as an anaesthetic, contributors debated the legitimacy of foreign investigations. Two regular features of foreign reportage, however, remained uncontroversial. First, both detractors of hypnotism, like Hart, and its supporters were quick to claim Braid as the founder of the "scientific study" of mesmerism ("Mr Langley" 575). The resurgence of medical interest might have started on the Continent, they acknowledged, but it was a Manchester doctor who made this later work possible. In 1891 one book reviewer remarked on "the wave of interest both in the practice and theory of hypnotism that during the last ten or twelve years has spread over the length and breadth of Europe, from Sweden to Spain, from Paris to Moscow. Yet hypnotism owes its name to England" (BMJ 27 June 1891, 1388). Second, reports of foreign prohibitions on public exhibitions of hypnotism in places such as Switzerland, Portugal, and Belgium met with unanimous agreement.[23] Medical men hoped for similar limitations to be imposed in Great Britain. As one commentator commented, "We can see no reason why the Home Secretary, armed as he is with powers for controlling public entertainments, should not forthwith prohibit hypnotic exhibitions as contrary to public policy, dangerous, and unedifying" ("Restriction" 1264).

These reports on foreign prohibitions of public exhibitions of hypnotism dovetailed with the ongoing concern about quackery, which surpassed hypnotism as a controversy in 1894-95. Anxieties about the proper qualification of medical professionals had preceded this revived interest in hypnotism and continued alongside it in the pages of the BMJ. In 1879, for example, the BMJ included only one article on hypnotism: specifically, an American doctor's investigation of the hypnotic state in pigeons. Brief pieces and letters to the editor about the policing of qualifications and the status of the profession, however, abounded. These concerns included the lowering of the profession's status by the dispensing of drugs by doctors rather than pharmacists; the use of unqualified assistants to the detriment of the profession; the need to regulate midwives by means of examination and licensing; and the necessary prosecution of quacks.[24] In 1890, fuelled by the serious medical investigations on the Continent, the lay public's appetite for hypnotism, and the preponderance of "unqualified" hypnotists feeding that appetite, the BMA appointed a committee to investigate the subject of hypnotism. At the Association's annual meeting in 1892, the committee "presented a report in which they said they had satisfied themselves of the genuineness of the hypnotic state" ("British Medical Association" 513). The report endorsed hypnotism as an effective therapeutic, lauding its potential to relieve pain, induce sleep, and generally alleviate ailments. It also expressed encouragement about the potential of hypnotism in the treatment of drunkenness. Notably, it did not praise hypnotism as an anaesthetic.

From 1878-98, reports of patients who died from chloroform inhalation prior to surgery appeared on a regular basis as did reports of the successful use of hypnotism as an anaesthetic during dental and medical surgeries. As one notice explained, "Hardly a

week passes without at least one death being reported as having occurred under chloroform" ("Deaths" 714).[25] Although chloroform superseded ether as the anaesthetic of choice in the 1840s, these reports suggest the dangers still associated with medical anaesthetics at the end of the century.[26] One of the problems with hypnotism as an anaesthesia for medical men in the 1890s was the impossibility of wresting the practice from its connotations as a lay entertainment. Medical men like Ernest Hart found themselves between a rock and a hard place. To deny the existence of hypnotism as a phenomenon would require the disavowal of the British tradition of scientific investigations of hypnotism by men like Braid. As we have seen, British medical men were eager to clam this national scientific tradition at a moment of increased international competition, with France and Germany in particular. To endorse hypnotic phenomena as legitimate, however, would require the concession that medical science as yet had not satisfactory explanation for them. This position ran the risk of representing medical science as impotent in the face of powers of the mind at a moment when the field of psychology professed otherwise.

Hart assumed the middle ground, arguing that hypnotic phenomena were real but that the power of hypnotism rested entirely with the subject rather than the hypnotiser. In January and February 1893, Hart published six weekly instalments in his series on "the New Mesmerism," based on his visit to the Salpêtrière in December 1892. Although he had previously participated in the "conversation" about hypnotism in the BMJ, this series was his most outspoken tirade against its practice. Hart's personal coverage of the subject began in December 1888, when he penned a series on "Medical Paris of To-day" as part of the "Special Correspondence" column, a regular feature of the journal. The series,

based on notes Hart made in December 1888, continued until May 1889. Hart acknowledged Charcot's experiments as "the chief basis of our present knowledge of hypnotism," but worried about the effects of such experiments on those undergoing hypnotism. The subject risked danger, he argued, "because, from the very character of [the subject's] neurosis, an evil-minded person might use him as an instrument, and make him do almost anything that he wished" (BMJ, 20 April 1889, 910). In an 1891 column, Hart differentiated between the Salpêtrière and Nancy schools for readers, and was more explicit about his skepticism: "Hypnotism may frequently be dangerous, and very rarely useful. It may be the cause of crime, or of mental disorder; it can really cure no disease not more easily curable by simpler and less dangerous methods" ("Schools and Doctrines" 723).

Hart's trenchant critique of hypnotism got under way in December 1892 with the publication of "Hypnotism, Animal Magnetism, and Hysteria," in which subtitles such as "Mesmer and His Dupes" and "The Therapeutic Uselessness and Social Mischief of Hypnotism" made clear his position. There was nothing mysterious about the process, he insisted in an effort to impart a rational explanation for the phenomena. The subject was someone who was prone to "a nervous condition or mental state" and the hypnotist merely facilitated the nervous sleep (Hart, "Animal Magnetism" 1216). In no uncertain terms he announced, "There is no such thing as a potent mesmeric influence, no such power resident in any one person more than another; [...] a glass of water, a tree, a stick, a penny-post letter, or a limelight can mesmerise as effectually as can anyone" (Hart, "Animal Magnetism" 1216). If anyone could successfully perform hypnotism on anyone else, what claims to authority and legitimacy could medical practitioners make about the

practice? Given the argument that the practice of hypnotism required no professional training or knowledge, one response was to distance the profession from hypnotism altogether. The BMJ's coverage of the committee report on hypnotism five years later was clear about the Association's repudiation of the report, but vague about the reasons why it was never adopted. As one contributor explained, "the treatment of hypnotism has not been officially recognised by the British Medical Association as a correct means of treatment by medical men" ("British Medical Association" 513).

What the debates about quackery and hypnotism shared was an explicit preoccupation with the question of medical qualification. Although the British medical community was internally divided about the value and effects of hypnotism throughout the 1880s and '90s, it was united in its concern that hypnotism as a field of investigation remain the purview of medical men. Given the possibility, elaborated by Hart, that hypnotism had little to do with the skill of the operator, this effort to retain hypnotism for strictly medical and scientific investigation was not without its problems as we shall see in the medical responses to its popular cultural representations. Nonetheless, Braid's concerns to differentiate his practice from that of itinerant mesmerists were reiterated by medical proponents of hypnotism at this later moment. As one advocate complained, "the cause of medical hypnotism has suffered through the confusion existing in the popular mind between it and the hypnotism of shows and entertainments" (Tuckey 682). In the next section, I analyse the medical community's responses to Trilby as one example of this egregious "hypnotism of shows and entertainments."

"Entertainment" Hypnotism

Although Leonée Ormond's biography does not indicate that Du Maurier participated in any mesmeric séances or attended any hypnotic demonstrations, he knew a bit about mesmerism from his student days in Antwerp. There, his close friend Felix Moscheles had regaled him with tales of his skills in mesmerism and the numerous women on whom he had experimented. The novel's representation of hypnotism evokes these early conversations with Moscheles and also suggests an awareness of the reading public's interest in hypnotic phenomena. Certainly by 1892, when Du Maurier was composing Trilby, hypnotism was a hot topic in the mainstream press and in the book world as well as in the medical community. By the early 1890s, there was much cross-over between these spheres of production. Doctors like R.W. Felkin, Norman Kerr, and George Kingsbury, who were active in debates about hypnotism within the medical community, published monographs on the subject, and prestigious foreign contributions, like Richard von Krafft-Ebing's Experimental Study in the Domain of Hypnotism (1889), were translated into English. London publisher Walter Scott also issued in 1890 a monograph on hypnotism by German doctor Albert Moll. Titled Hypnotism, it was an addition to the Contemporary Science Series, edited by Havelock Ellis, which aimed to "bring within general reach of the English-speaking public the best that is known and thought in all departments of modern scientific research" (Moll, advertisement n.p.). Well-known medical men debated the merits and dangers of hypnotism in the mainstream press, Charcot in the Forum, Luys in the Fortnightly Review, C. Theodore Ewart and George Kingsbury in the Nineteenth Century, and A. Taylor Innes and Charles Lloyd Tuckey in the Contemporary Review. The Quarterly Review provided an anonymous

review of six monographs by French experts like Bernheim, Luys, and Liégeois. And writers like Hamilton Aïdé, who published "Was I Hypnotised?" in the Nineteenth Century, weighed in with personal anecdotes about their experiences of the practice.

As I have already suggested in my analysis of the writing on hypnotism in the BMJ, one of the central preoccupations in debates about hypnotism was the question of the hypnotist's power or influence over the hypnotized subject. Du Maurier's narrative took advantage of this contentious issue, representing hypnotism as the nefarious means of Svengali's control over Trilby. In spite of Trilby's initial misgivings about his character, she permits him to relieve her debilitating neuralgia by submitting to hypnosis. This scene of hypnotism combines the technique of concentration favoured by Braid with the "passes" performed by the operator, which were more commonly associated with mesmerism. Svengali's demand that Trilby "'Recartez-moi pien tans le planc tes yeux'" (Ormond 57) is consistent with contemporary accounts of inducing the hypnotic state. As a correspondent to The Times put it, "Various methods are employed, but by far the most common is to make the patient fix the gaze on some object at a short distance, and regard it steadily for a while. It does not seem to matter much what the object is – whether the doctor's eyes or a piece of metal or anything else that is bright – so long as it is of a nature to seize and hold the attention" ("The New Mesmerism" 6). As in this account of hypnotic methods employed in Paris hospitals, Svengali requires Trilby to look into the whites of his eyes before making "little passes and counterpasses on her forehead and temples and down her neck and cheek. Soon her eyes closed and her face grew placid" (Du Maurier, Trilby 57).

But Du Maurier's description makes clear that in this hypnotic state, Trilby is subject to Svengali's will. He describes her as "spellbound" until Svengali decides, "'I will now set her free'" (Du Maurier, Trilby 57). The language of freedom and its implied corollary of imprisonment that Du Maurier has Svengali speak here indicates the extent to which Trilby, in her hypnotic state, is vulnerable to Svengali's power as operator. This power is rendered even more ominous by Svengali's suggestion that Trilby "'shall see nothing, hear nothing, think of nothing but Svengali, Svengali, Svengali'" (Du Maurier, Trilby 60). Du Maurier was clearly conscious of the work of this scene in characterizing Svengali as dangerous. In his handwritten emendations to the original typescript of the novel, Du Maurier inserted the repetitive phrase, "hear nothing, think of nothing," which was an addition to the original manuscript (MA 1950 R-V Harper Coll.). When Svengali offers to cure Trilby's pain on a regular basis, Du Maurier also suggests that there exists more than a mere rapport between himself as operator and Trilby as hypnotized subject. Svengali remarks, "'when your pain arrives, then shall you come once more to Svengali, and he shall take it away from you, and keep it himself for a soufenir [sic] of you when you are gone'" (Du Maurier, Trilby 60). The ominous intimation here is that Svengali's hypnotic powers permit him to retain something of Trilby's soul, even in her absence. The Laird's response to this scene of hypnotism in the novel dramatizes the broader public debates about hypnotism in the 1880s and 1890s that I have described. Although Trilby is grateful to Svengali for alleviating her pain, the Laird warns her about Svengali and the dangers of his hypnotic ways: "'I'd sooner have any pain than have it cured in that unnatural way, and by such a man as that! He's a bad fellow, Svengali – I'm sure of it! He mesmerised you; that's what it is – mesmerism! I've often heard of it, but never

seen it done before. They get you into their power, and just make you do any blessed thing they please – lie, murder, steal – anything! And kill yourself into the bargain when they've done with you! It's just too terrible to think of!'" (Du Maurier, Trilby 60).

Ernest Hart approved of Du Maurier's representation of hypnotism, suggesting that Du Maurier's novel occupied a middle ground between "medical" hypnotism and "entertainment" hypnotism. In the BMJ he remarked, "Mr. Du Maurier may be congratulated on having produced for the first time a literary masterpiece in which the conditions of hypnotism are used with the power of genius, and in which their limitations and nature are correctly indicated if not fully analysed or described" ("Hypnotism of 'Trilby'" 1052). Hart's approval of Du Maurier's representation of Svengali's power over Trilby may appear at first blush to contradict his emphasis, in "The New Mesmerism," on the subject's orchestration of hypnotic effects. Hart's position, however, remained consistent. Although he doubted the veracity of the hypnotic state in some of Charcot's patients, for example, he did not deny the possibility of hypnotism altogether. Because he differentiated between the cause of hypnotism and its effects, he could claim that the subject was primarily responsible for the extent of her hypnosis, but that once hypnotised, she was susceptible to suggestion from others. This position enabled him to decry the involvement of non-professionals in hypnotism. For Hart, the subject's vulnerability to suggestion under hypnosis made the hypnotic state potentially dangerous, particularly when unqualified or criminally minded practitioners presided over it. Hart's attention to Trilby suggests that the accuracy of representations of hypnotism became another means by which medical men could consolidate the authority of "medical" hypnotism over

"entertainment" hypnotism. It also became a means by which writers could stake a claim to cultural authority.

The accurate representation of hypnotism was an important concern for the author of Trilby's stage adaptation, as I have already suggested. In May 1895, Paul Potter remarked on his extensive research to a Metropolitan Magazine interviewer. Potter identified his primary sources as Charcot's Experiments at the Salpetriere, Bjornstrom's History of Hypnotism, and Braid's Observations on Trance.[27] As he remarked, "It is because I made such a deep and careful study of hypnotism that I was enabled to make the pivot of the play as strong as I have done" (Stetson 238). But Potter's copious researches failed to convince the medical professionals whose archives he had plundered. A year later Ernest Hart reissued his monograph, Hypnotism, Mesmerism, and the New Witchcraft, with a new "Appendix on Trilby." In it, he castigated Potter's representation of hypnotism as a "vulgar error."[28]

In Potter's stage adaptation of Trilby, Svengali's hypnotic powers were rendered even more threatening than in Du Maurier's novel. Rather than leaving the hero of her own volition, Trilby abandons him because she is hypnotized by Svengali. The evening of her elopement with the hero, Svengali hypnotizes her under the guise of alleviating her headache and dictates a letter addressed to the hero in which she breaks with him and leaves town. He controls not only her voice, but also her will. The theatre reviewer for the Standard complained about the use of hypnotism in this scene. Potter's script had gone too far in "depriv[ing] poor Trilby of all credit for her deed of renunciation" ("Haymarket").[29] Hart went further, criticizing Potter for turning Svengali into a kind of platform performer who combined the most fraudulent aspects of mesmerism. Hart

identified Svengali's bogus feats as the "force" he passes into Trilby and his ability to command her telepathically from another room to come to him. He also worried that the play might "renew for a time the vogue of the follies and frauds of the sham 'hypnotism, mesmerism, and new magic'" (Hart, "Hypnotism of 'Trilby'").

Reviewers in the mainstream press seemed prepared to chalk up these portrayals of hypnotism to theatrical effect rather than realistic representation. As the reviewer for the Evening News remarked, "Svengali, in fact, dies like a creator or an artist, worn out by the loss of nervous energy -- a fate more apt to be depicted in fiction than encountered in life" ("Trilby," Evening News). This reviewer's differentiation between fiction and reality suggests that audiences were not necessarily as susceptible to suggestion as Hart worried they were. Frilby, a burlesque of Trilby written in 1895, went so far as to parody the histrionic use of hypnotism.[30] It explicitly mocked Herbert Beerbohm Tree's performance as Svengali, and included a scene in which Svengali must hypnotize the wandering limelight in order to keep it focused on him.

Hart's engagements with the accuracy of representation in Trilby were ostensibly made in the name of the public good. But his casting of himself in the role of arbiter of accuracy suggests the stakes of the debates about hypnotism: Who was qualified to judge the representation of hypnotism? And, perhaps more importantly, who was qualified to perform it? The preoccupation with quackery in the British Medical Journal provides an apt context for Hart's underlying concerns about the public representation of "entertainment" hypnotism. In the same year as Trilby's initial publication, Hart spearheaded a campaign against quackery which was not limited to the pages of the Journal. In articles like "The Press, the Quacks, and the Public," Hart urged the leading

newspapers to aid in the suppression of quackery by refusing advertising space to unqualified practitioners and vendors of dubious medicines. He also proposed a committee to lobby for medical reforms which would benefit both the public interest and the interests of the medical profession by reducing the prevalence of quackery.[31] In a memorial to Hart published in the British Medical Journal after his death in 1898, the author lauded Hart's campaigns on behalf of the medical profession. He singled out Hart's 1893 series on the new mesmerism as exemplary, remarking, "Quacks are irrepressible, and those who flourish chiefly on female weaknesses most irrepressible of all; but all that could be done towards putting down one of the most mischievous of quackeries was effected by these admirable articles" (Holmes 177).

Hart's criticisms of the accuracy of hypnotism in various productions of Trilby functioned to police the boundaries of the medical profession. Despite internal disputes over the value and effects of hypnotism, medical practitioners were united in their insistence that the study of hypnotism be the exclusive domain of medical science. Hart criticized the representation of hypnotism as Svengali performed it in Potter's stage adaptation, but the character of Svengali actually embodied anxieties that both medical men and the mainstream press professed about the potential abuses of hypnotism. As one theatre reviewer noted, "In divers ways [Svengali] experimented upon Trilby, and rendered it clear that the future of the girl was to a great extent in his hands" ("Death of Svengali"). In this formulation, Trilby becomes the living object of Svengali's vivisection. The reviewer's implicit invocation of vivisection brings to mind the heated debates of the late 1870s and early 1880s, thoroughly documented by Richard D. French, in which anti-vivisectionist agitators clashed with pro-vivisectionist medical men. In its

association of Svengali with vivisectionists, it foregrounds the extent to which laypeople worried about becoming the unwitting objects of experimentation by medical men.[32] These reviews suggest that the unspoken anxiety surrounding the representation of hypnotism in Trilby for Hart specifically and for the medical community generally was this: to claim the exclusive right to hypnotic experimentation was to run the risk of being identified as a Svengali by the public.

Hart worked to distance the medical profession from "entertainment" hypnotism by criticizing such performances and representations from a medical perspective. This criticism both relied on and served to buttress his position of medical authority. But the invocation and assumption of this authority risked affiliating medical men with the character of Svengali in the public imagination. As we have seen, this character simultaneously took on various connotations. On the one hand, medical men risked association with the malevolent Svengali of Beerbohm Tree's production by a public which, like Potter, increasingly accorded medical science a certain cultural authority. On the other hand, they risked association with the buffoonish Svengali of Frilby in which the project of hypnotism was ridiculed.[33] Neither of these associations boded well for a medical profession keen to maintain its hard-won authority and status. But, in a sense, these opposing public perceptions of hypnotism echoed debates about the practice within the medical profession. The mockery of hypnotism in Frilby figured a radically sceptical view of the practice, while the vilification of Svengali in Beerbohm Tree's production figured the view maintained by moralists, that hypnotism was a dangerous practice for the vulnerable subject.[34] There appeared to be no middle ground between the buffoonish Svengali of Frilby and Beerbohm Tree's villain. And Trilby was not alone in representing

the hypnotist as a dangerous figure. In the next section, I trace the development in the 1880s and 1890s of a sub-genre of fiction about hypnotism, to which Trilby was one contribution, in order to explain the medical community's investment in such popular cultural representations of hypnotism and, especially, the figure of the hypnotist.

Crime and Hypnotism

In November 1888, the London Times reported on an Algerian murder trial that had divided public opinion. In January of the same year, the wounded twenty-three-year-old Henri Chambige had been found prostrate alongside the body of Madame Madeleine Grille. She had been shot twice in the head by Chambige, who claimed they had undertaken a murder-suicide pact. She was determined to elope with him or to die, he insisted. Friends and family of the married Mme Grille were outraged, declaring that "her character was above all suspicion" ("Tragedy" 5). They vehemently denied his allegations and protested that he had mesmerized his victim and then murdered her. Chambige refuted the charges of mesmerism, but was found guilty under extenuating circumstances and sentenced to five years in prison.[35]

Two years later, in December 1890, the Times reported on the first day of the Eyraud-Bompard murder trial in Paris, which became a *cause célèbre* in both the French and English press from December 1890 through February 1891.[36] Twenty-two-year-old Gabrielle Bompard was accused of colluding with her middle-aged lover Michel Eyraud to rob and murder a wealthy bailiff in Paris. Faced with the prosecution's charge of murder, Bompard responded by claiming that "she had acted under a post-hypnotic suggestion implanted by her former lover" (Harris 197). This line of defence required the intervention of medical experts to ascertain its validity. French experts were called upon

to examine Bompard's susceptibility to hypnotic suggestion and to testify about the viability of her story. Eyraud, in his turn, insisted that he had been subjected to the nefarious influence of Bompard—specifically her "youth, beauty, and insatiable appetites" (Harris 200)—and had thus been compelled to participate in the murder. Eyraud was guillotined in 1891; Bompard escaped capital punishment, although not imprisonment, and was out on early parole by 1903.

These two narratives about the potential dangers and abuses of hypnotism at the *fin de siècle* are typical of popular late-Victorian representations in their linkage of crime and hypnotism. As Alan Gauld notes in his History of Hypnotism, "in the second half of the 1880s, and for much of the 1890s, no aspect of hypnotism attracted greater interest, popular, medical, scientific and literary, than that of its possible adaptation to criminal ends" (Gauld 494). In the medical and mainstream presses the topic of hypnotism, already hotly contested, accrued even more urgency as medical men and laypeople debated its potential role in criminal activity. The common features of the newspaper reports on the Chambige and Eyraud-Bompard cases neatly summarize the central preoccupations in these late-Victorian debates about the relationship between crime and hypnotism: Could the subject be held responsible for actions performed under hypnosis? Was the use of hypnotism to criminal ends a gendered phenomenon? How could the abuse of hypnotism be prevented? And if the hypnotist could exert his power either to violate his subject or to control the subject's actions, what were the implications for the implementation of hypnotism by the medical profession?

In this section I examine how these questions circulated in late-Victorian debates about the value and function of hypnotism, concentrating specifically on the figure of the

hypnotist in order to explore why it became such a contested figure for both medical men and the lay public in the late 1880s and 1890s. I focus initially on arguments in the medical and mainstream presses, where concern centred on the dangers posed by unqualified hypnotists and the hypnotized subject's vulnerability to crime as either an unwitting accomplice to or victim of the hypnotist. I then consider how fictional representations of the malevolent hypnotist registered popular anxieties about the power of the hypnotist and challenged the implementation of hypnotism as a viable medical therapeutic. My analysis of a sample of novels involving hypnotism—novels which I claim constitute a sub-genre of late-Victorian fiction—suggests that these popular representations of the hypnotist as criminal rendered problematic any advocacy of hypnotism by the medical profession at the *fin de siècle*. As I show, medical men strove to appropriate hypnotism as the exclusive purview of their profession. Their efforts to establish their legitimacy to this claim, however, could not ultimately legitimize the figure of the hypnotist. Represented as a threatening criminal, the hypnotist figure of late-Victorian fiction exceeded the medical profession's ability to recuperate this role for themselves.

Hypnotism on Trial

As historian Ruth Harris has shown, the Bompard-Eyraud case put on trial not only the alleged murderers, but also contemporary medical theories about hypnotism. In the Paris courtroom, proponents of the Salpêtrière and Nancy schools squared off as expert witnesses, each providing an explanation for Bompard's behaviour based on their respective theories about hypnotism.[37] The Salpêtrière school, primarily identified with Charcot and his famous experiments on hysterical women in Paris, held that hypnosis

was merely a symptom of hysteria. According to Charcot and his followers, there were three states of hypnosis: catalepsy, in which the immobile subject's muscular rigidity was heightened and her sensitivity to pain might be nullified by the operator; lethargy, in which the subject was in a state of sleep and her relaxed musculature rendered possible sexual violation; and somnambulism, in which the subject was in a "magnetic sleep" and therefore highly suggestible. Each of these states represented an increasingly vulnerable situation for the hypnotized subject.[38] By contrast, the Nancy school, primarily identified with psychiatrist Hippolyte Bernheim and Administrative Law Professor Jules Liégeois, both of the University of Nancy, held that hypnosis was not a pathological symptom but a temporary state induced by suggestion.

Experts from each school arrived in the courtroom to testify as expert witnesses. Liégeois supported the defence by claiming that "anyone with a sufficiently impressionable nature could be prevailed upon to act unconsciously under the influence and power of external suggestion" (Harris "Murder" 198). Paul Brouardel and two other forensic psychiatrists of the Paris school testified for the prosecution, insisting that hysteria was a requisite condition for hypnosis and that Bompard had failed to provide adequate evidence of full-blown hysteria which would diminish her capacity for judgment or her criminal responsibility. Just as Bompard's claim to have been hypnotized by Eyraud was subject to opposing interpretations by the Paris and Nancy experts, so too was her behaviour, during and before the crime, subject to contradictory interpretations. Was she, as she claimed, an innocent, naïve victim who had been taken ruthless advantage of by the brutish Eyraud? Or was she "a Parisian *gavroche* who lied, cheated, and stole to satisfy her sensual appetites" (Harris 202)?

These conflicting interpretations of Bompard's morals and behaviour figured the conflict between the Paris and Nancy schools on the subject of hypnotism and its dangers. More importantly, they also figured the primary anxieties about the dangers of hypnotism promulgated in the periodical press and in fiction at the moment of the trial: first, that hypnotism rendered the often female subject prone to the predations of malevolent operators; second, that hypnotism could redirect the subject's moral compass, subjecting her to the will of the operator and removing, with a few gestures of the operator's hands, all moral and sexual inhibitions; and third, that hypnotism, like lunacy, could become an alibi for the commission of crime, relieving the criminal of legal responsibility. In the first two scenarios, the operator successfully rendered the subject an automaton to be violated or commanded according to his will. In the third scenario, the criminal claimed to have been rendered an automaton in order to avoid prosecution. All three interpretations or dangers turned on the possibility of will transference and its abuse for criminal purposes. They also pointed to the thorny issue of criminal responsibility in cases of crimes perpetrated by or on the hypnotized subject: Did hypnotism divest the subject of her waking moral sensibilities and therefore render her not responsible for offences committed against or by her while hypnotized? Or did hypnotism enable the hypnotist to perform or command only activities that the waking subject would normally consider morally acceptable?

The question of criminal responsibility had assumed an important function for the medical profession, especially since the legal reforms of the 1860s and 1870s had taken into consideration changing medical understandings of lunacy. "Criticism of the restrictive definition . . . of legal insanity as an essentially intellectual impairment

(ascertainable by laypeople) of the ability to distinguish right from wrong became a rallying point for professional self-definition" (Wiener 270), as Martin Wiener points out. Medical men increasingly demanded recognition in the legal sphere as the sole experts sufficiently equipped to assess mental states and therefore culpability. These demands did not go uncontested either by the legal profession or in the mainstream press. As the Times complained about medical efforts to establish insanity as the grounds for criminal non-responsibility, "Is it not pretty plain that the extreme medical view of responsibility will not work further than as an agency for the abolition of capital punishment?" (1 Sep. 1894: 9).[39] In the case of hypnotism, the question of criminal responsibility became a flashpoint for public anxiety and medical concern in the context of broader debates about the value and function of hypnotism generally and the role of the hypnotist specifically. If the hypnotized subject was a slave to the hypnotist's will, as popular representations suggested, criminal responsibility lay squarely with the hypnotist as either a criminal mastermind or a criminal *tout court*, assaulting women subjects under his influence. As we shall see, the conflation of the hypnotist and the criminal boded ill for medical men who were eager to investigate the therapeutic potential and scientific value of hypnotism. As the Nancy-Salpêtrière conflict indicates, medical men grappled with competing theories about hypnotism throughout the 1880s and 1890s in an effort to determine how hypnotism worked and to what extent it involved the influence of the operator on his subject. These late-Victorian debates about hypnotism within the medical community conferred a certain, if short-lived, legitimacy on a practice that had long been associated with charlatanism.

In the early 1880s, when Charcot's experiments consecrated hypnotism as a legitimate object of scientific investigation, British medical men tentatively expressed interest in the therapeutic possibilities of the practice. At the 1880 annual meeting, members of the Physiology section of the British Medical Association welcomed a German professor who spoke on the subject of "Sleep and Hypnotism." To the assembled crowd of medical men, Professor Preyer remarked, "So far as we know—and thousands of experiments have been performed—hypnotism is entirely harmless, at least if not practiced to excess" ("Discussion" 382). By the late 1880s and early 1890s, however, articles warning against the "Dangers of Hypnotism" had become a commonplace in the annals of the BMJ.[40] Hypnotism was greeted by the British medical community with increasing caution and debates about hypnotism within that medical community were characterized by an increasingly heated tone.

Although the cautionary injunctions against the use of hypnotism became more frequent throughout the 1880s, it would be wrong to suggest that the practice of hypnotism was widely accepted as a legitimate medical procedure when Charcot undertook his investigations. To the contrary, hypnotism had fallen out of favour as a legitimate focus of medical and scientific investigation because of its pedigree. Since surgeon James Braid had named and developed his theory of hypnotism in the early 1840s, the practice had been irrevocably associated with mesmerism.[41] Braid's valiant efforts to distinguish theoretically between mesmerism and hypnotism, and thereby to dispel any whiff of fraudulence or charlatanism from hypnotism, went largely unheeded. When Charcot's experiments revived medical interest in hypnotism in the late nineteenth century, hypnotism was linked to mesmerism by both supporters and detractors of the

practice, as my analysis of Ernest Hart's response to hypnotism has shown. Historians of hypnotism have acknowledged this slippage, identifying the end of the century as the period during which "mesmerism became known as hypnotism" (Dingwall, Introduction vii).[42]

The ascendancy of chemical anaesthesias was not the sole reason for the failure of mesmerism within the medical community, however. Medical interest in mesmerism had waned in the aftermath of John Elliotson's famous 1837-38 experiments on the O'Key sisters at University College London. After Elliotson's experiments were discredited by Lancet editor Thomas Wakley, he was forced to resign his academic position.[43] In the wake of Elliotson's disgrace, the medical community shied away from further investigations of mesmerism, tainted as it was with fraudulence and failure. As one medical enthusiast of hypnotism later observed, surely referring to Elliotson among others, "many great men . . . made shipwreck of their reputations on the rock of mesmerism" ("Royal Academy" 1024). That mesmerism had offered a safe and effective anaesthetic was forgotten with the advent of chemical anaesthesias. But Elliotson's downfall lingered in the popular and medical imaginations and provided one explanatory model for hypnotism that would rear its head once again in the 1880s and 1890s—that of the naïve doctor who is deceived by the duplicitous performances of his female subjects.

When Charcot's investigations prompted the reinvigoration of hypnotic experimentation among medical men in the 1880s, proponents of hypnotism as a medical therapeutic found themselves battling popular perceptions of hypnotism as merely a reconfigured version of mesmerism. As the decade progressed, hypnotism's implication in criminal acts perpetrated by and on hypnotized subjects also threatened to undermine

the validity of medical investigations of hypnotism. Medical men and laypeople alike were keenly aware of the lingering connotations of hypnotism in the popular cultural imagination. Just as hypnotism was already tainted by its association with mesmerism when Charcot undertook his investigations in the late 1870s, so it continued to be associated with dubious fringe sciences throughout the rest of the century. Medical proponents of hypnotism could not shrug its associations with mesmerism, and they could not arrest the further associations that it accrued, primarily with the increasingly popular spiritualism. In one of his vituperative attacks on hypnotism and its fraudulent practitioners, BMJ editor Ernest Hart alluded to Browning's "Sludge," explicitly linking the figures of the hypnotist and the fraudulent medium. And in 1894, several articles in the BMJ identified automatic writing as the link between hypnotism and spiritualism, noting that "the hypnotic *furore*" had been surpassed "by the revival of the spiritualistic under the leadership of Mr. Stead" (Clark 37).[44] Proponents of hypnotism as a viable anaesthetic and therapeutic thus faced considerable opposition within the medical community in their efforts to defend the practice and its potential scientific value. In response to this opposition, they attempted to present the healing face of hypnotism. They lauded its therapeutic effects on a variety of "moral ailments," including insanity, "inebriety, morphinomania, cocainomania, kleptomania, and masturbation" ("Royal Academy" 1023).[45] As hypnotism was increasingly discussed as a motivation for criminal activity, its medical proponents countered with the hypothesis that hypnotism could serve as a means of discerning the truth of criminal activity—of correctly identifying criminals and discovering their mode of operation.[46] This defence of hypnotism was difficult to maintain given the increasingly specific dangers enumerated by skeptical medical men.

Detractors of hypnotism within the medical community voiced two main arguments against the scientific investigation of hypnotism. First, they claimed that hypnotism was morally and physically degrading to both the hypnotized subject and the general public that witnessed exploitative performances of hypnotism. Second, they warned that the practice of hypnotism was "attended with many dangers" ("Hypnotism," *BMJ* 962) for the hypnotized subject, on whom it acted as a "dangerous mental poison" ("Restriction" 1264). In the late 1870s and early 1880s, neither of these criticisms found expression in concrete examples. Correspondents and journalists in the BMJ warned vaguely against the demoralizing effects of hypnotism and the nebulous dangers that it held for subjects. It was not until the mid-1880s that these dangers were made explicit: the danger of sexual assault on the one hand, and the danger of enforced criminality on the other hand. Anticipating the bent of mainstream coverage of the Chambige and Eyraud-Bompard cases, the BMJ emphasized the potential danger of crimes perpetrated under hypnotic influence. Rather than providing detailed coverage of actual sexual assaults on hypnotized female subjects, however, the BMJ described the mock commission of crimes by hypnotized subjects under the watchful eye of medical investigators.

Experiments on mesmerized subjects had long involved instruction to commit acts inimical to the waking subject's moral sense.[47] In the earlier phase of mesmeric investigation by the medical community, this instruction often involved, for example, requiring the subject to drink a glass of water which the subject understood to be a glass of alcohol. The subject would then usually display symptoms of inebriation. In this earlier moment, the subject's misapprehension of the water as alcohol was not understood

as a consequence of suggestion, but was interpreted as the ability of the mesmerist to mesmerize the water and to impose his or her will on the subject. In the 1880s and 1890s, these instructions assumed increasingly sensational proportions.[48] Subjects were frequently commanded to perform violent and criminal acts. Instructions to imbibe water mistaken for alcohol were abandoned and subjects were instead respectfully requested to "murder" their friends and family in cold blood in the presence of fascinated audiences.

On 26 January 1886, the BMJ reported a case of "Telephonic Hypnotism" by Liégeois, who had been experimenting with giving suggestions over the telephone to hypnotized subjects who then proceeded to commit the recommended crime. In this instance, Liégeois instructed the young man to fire a revolver and steal a five franc piece, which offences he duly committed upon waking from the hypnotic sleep. Less egregious were Liégeois's suggestions, reported in the 27 March 1886 BMJ, that two hypnotized medical students in his audience forget all proper names and speak only in infinitive verbs. If these suggestions were less egregious, they were also less common. Increasingly *de rigueur* in both medical investigations and public exhibitions of hypnotism were outlandish suggestions involving crime and violence. The BMJ reported on and condemned public lectures and experiments by non-medical practitioners in part because they often involved the moral degradation of the hypnotized subject. In some cases the degradation born by the subject involved demonstrating the subject's uninhibited state; in other cases it involved the mock commission of violent crimes by the hypnotized subject. On 21 May 1887, for example, the BMJ condemned "the abuse of hypnotism" at a Paris exhibition where a hypnotized woman exposed herself "for the pleasure and entertainment of a public eager for a new sensation" ("Abuse" 1121). And on 24

November 1888, the BMJ lambasted a London entertainment during which a self-proclaimed "Belgian professor" hypnotized his subject and implanted a post-hypnotic suggestion that he murder his father. Upon awakening, the subject "[took] his neighbour for his father [and] enjoyed killing him in cold blood" ("Public" 1176).

Despite these imaginary crimes committed by hypnotized subjects, the British Medical Association committee struck in 1890 to investigate hypnotism concluded that "we have not yet sufficient proof that post-hypnotic suggestion has led to actual crime" ("Investigation" 476).[49] And yet medical men worried about and warned against the dangers of hypnotism. In response to Ernest Hart's condemnation of hypnotism in the *BMJ* as "almost invariably useless and often dangerous" (Hart 1220), one proponent of the practice responded, "How are we to eliminate this uncertainty [about the adaptability of hypnotism to criminal ends] when we are frustrated by so-called scientists . . . hounding us down and holding us up to public opprobrium as dangerous characters?" (Davis 1375). For medical advocates of hypnotism, this question—the apparent contradiction between the professed lack of evidence of hypnotism's relationship to criminal activity and the recurring and anxious concern about hypnotism's adaptation for dangerous purposes—was key. In numerous articles and letters to the editor of the BMJ, medical men construed the danger of hypnotism not as the nefarious influence of a malevolent operator, but as experimentation with and public demonstrations of hypnotism by unqualified practitioners.[50] The reaction of the medical community to these shows demonstrates how such entertainments threatened to impugn the credibility of medical proponents of hypnotism. And they had reason to worry: these entertainments

were enormously popular with audiences, and "one of the most attractive features of the shows" (Kingsbury "Public" 391) was the mock commission of violent crimes.

If a mere itinerant, unqualified hypnotist could enjoin the hypnotized subject to commit such mock crimes as the murder of a family member, what terrible powers of influence might hypnotism promise to the evil-minded criminal? This was the question that worried not only the lay public but also the medical community. But the adaptation to criminal ends of hypnotism was not the only public concern the medical community needed to address. Since Charcot had undertaken his experiments in hypnotism in the late 1870s, allegations of sexual offences committed by hypnotists had appeared in the press. Brouardel, expert for the prosecution during the Bompard trial, had investigated in 1878 the case against Paul Lévy, an itinerant Jewish dentist who stood accused of sexually assaulting a young virginal patient in Rouen after she had been placed in a trance. Lévy insisted that their dalliance had been consensual, as was supported by circumstantial evidence; he was nonetheless found guilty and sentenced to ten years imprisonment.[51] Throughout the 1880s and 1890s, such stories of sexual license taken by hypnotists appeared in the press. Medical proponents of hypnotism might contest the validity of these stories, but they needed to protect themselves from such accusations. Medical lecturers on hypnotism advised their "hearers never to hypnotise a stranger without a witness, and under no circumstances to hypnotise a female except in the presence of a reliable third person, preferably the husband in the case of a married woman" (29 Nov. 1890).[52]

Whereas French medical men took advantage of the debates about criminal responsibility to stake a claim to medico-legal authority in the courtroom, as was the case

during the Eyraud-Bompard trial, British medical men claimed professional authority by laying criminal responsibility at the feet of charlatans and unqualified practitioners. The stories of sexual license taken by hypnotists threatened to implicate medical men in a criminal role they were eager to refute. In response to the criminalization of the hypnotist, the British medical community's strategy was twofold: first, to vilify unqualified practitioners of hypnotism and charlatans alike; and second, to construe doctors undertaking experiments on hypnotism as the victims of duplicitous female subjects. In both cases, doctors managed to figure themselves not as the agents of crime but as its victims. The primary social danger was not hypnotist doctors but impostors seeking to profit by exploiting the public fascination with hypnotism. Indeed, argued some medical men, these cases of hypnotism by unqualified and untrustworthy operators claimed the attention not merely of the medical profession but also of the law. Noted an outraged doctor in the BMJ, "the majority of alleged cases, which are probably wholly impostures, require the supervision of the police more than that of the physician" (13 Aug. 1881).

Although this strategy effectively enabled medical men to disavow any associations with the figure of the criminal hypnotist, it required them to avow their potential impotence in the hands of wily female subjects. Criminal or dupe: the role of hypnotist seemed to offer no tenable position for medical men beyond this crude opposition. And whereas medical men sought to construe themselves as victims of duplicitous female subjects and charlatans alike, readers of fiction increasingly associated the figures of the hypnotist and the criminal. It was a conflation that became harder and harder for medical proponents of hypnotism to surmount.

Reading the Hypnotist as Criminal

> "Every real reform must rest upon the cure of the vitiated volition. It must be natural, not mechanical; psychical, not physical; it must start from within, not from without. Its motive power must be something which acts directly and powerfully upon the will. Where shall we find such an agent?" (Lilly, "Philosophy" 238)

For many late-Victorian medical men espousing its therapeutic possibilities, the answer might well have been hypnotism. W.S. Lilly's question, posed in "The Philosophy of Crime," however, was rhetorical.[53] In the conclusion of his 1894 Contemporary Review article, Lilly responded that it is the task of religion rather than education to "cure. . . the vitiated volition" of the criminal. He engaged recent Lombrosian theories in the emergent field of criminal anthropology, refuting what he perceived as the leniency of reformist penal measures developed to reflect these new theories of criminal behaviours and propensities. "Crime," worried Lilly, "does not exist, for the doctors of criminal anthropology: the malefactor is not really criminal at all. He is to be regarded as a psychopath [sic], a moral invalid, the victim of a mind diseased, of an organization malformed, impoverished, or incomplete, of a temperament hallucinative or epileptic" (221). The consequence of this pathologization of criminal behaviour, according to Lilly, was the clinical treatment of criminals rather than their punishment. In New York's Elmira Reformatory, Lilly wrote, inmates enjoy a standard of living far superior to law-abiding citizens of a similar class; they are well fed, clothed, and lodged, and they have access to the Reformatory library, which boasts a collection of "the best contemporary publications. . . [and] a liberal supply of newspapers and periodicals" (223).[54] Lilly's allusion to the reading of prison inmates in an article on crime is notable.

The implicit suggestion is that the Elmira reformatory risked treating its inmates like gentlemen rather than criminals; reading "the best" recent publications and current newspapers was a pleasure incongruous with Lilly's idea of punishment. At the moment when Lilly was writing, another criticism might have been leveled at the reformatory: that inmates' reading of current publications and newspapers could contribute to recidivism rather than rehabilitation.

Reading assumed an important role in explaining both the causes and potential dangers of crimes in mainstream and medical press coverage of hypnotism's adaptation to criminal ends. In its coverage of the Chambige trial, for example, the Times insisted that Chambige's reading habits had contributed to his criminal behaviour: "It is clear that Chambige, whose head had been turned by reading unhealthy novels, was bent on creating a sensation and on imagining himself a kind of hero" (9 Nov. 1888, 5). "Unhealthy novels," the newspaper suggests, served as negative models for criminal behaviour that was glorified rather than vilified in such fiction. The prosecution even invoked Chambige's interest in decadent literature as evidence of his moral corruption and argued that this literature had influenced his behaviour.[55]

This argument participated in broader debates about the function of reading, especially sensational literature, at a historical moment when one perceived democratizing effect of the Education Acts of the 1870s and 1880s was a rapidly increasing literacy rate. Moral crusaders, writers, and the public at large debated the moral consequences for working-class readers, children, and women of reading what the National Vigilance Association termed "pernicious literature."[56] The concern was that such reading would prompt a mimetic response from readers. This argument also

extended to the medical and scientific communities which worried about the threat of theatricals and fictions providing criminal examples to vulnerable audiences and readers. In a chapter on "Criminal Literature and Art" in The Criminal (1890), a volume heavily indebted to Lombroso's earlier Criminal Man, Havelock Ellis argued that "it is youths and children who are especially prone to the imitation of criminal events from books or from real life" (Ellis 220). And the Lancet warned against "stage spectacles" in which scenes of deliberate destruction were portrayed because "certain forms of mental disease are known to be mimetic, and there seems to be reason to suppose that in one case at least a morbid mind has been so influenced as to perpetrate what, if it were not madness, would be an atrocious crime" (8 Nov. 1884).

Proponents of hypnotism like George Kingsbury and A. Taylor Innes emphasized the dangers of reading as well; as advocates of the medical investigation of hypnotism, however, they focused their criticism on the inflammatory misrepresentations of hypnotism in fiction and the press. For Kingsbury and Innes, as for so many other proponents of hypnotism as a viable medical tool, fictional representations of hypnotism were pernicious not only because they modeled how hypnotism might be adapted to criminal ends, but also because they inflamed public anxiety about the practice even as they got the science of hypnotism wrong. Innes decried the insistence of "our novelists and poets" (560) on the mechanism of will-force, for which no evidence existed. In a similar vein, Kingsbury blamed "alarmist writers" (148) for scaremongering and setting the public against any further legitimate investigation of hypnotism by medical men. And in an 1890 article on "Hypnotism and Crime," Charcot himself made clear that the

medical community was the victim of "exaggerated and distorted" (165) newspaper accounts of "frauds and crimes" (165) involving hypnotism.

Kingsbury, Innes, and Charcot made strange bedfellows given Kingsbury's and Innes's adherence to the tenets of the Nancy School. Innes went so far as to describe Charcot's female patients at the Salpêtrière as "girl graduates who have taken a high degree in hysteria" (Innes 560). Despite this antipathy toward Charcot's method and theory, however, Kingsbury and Innes shared with Charcot the unwavering conviction that medical men should be granted sole legitimate authority over the investigation of hypnotism. Indeed, what both proponents and detractors of the medical investigation of hypnotism shared was the staunch belief that only medical men were adequately knowledgeable and trustworthy to undertake such investigations without posing a threat to the hypnotized subject's mental or physical health.

The lay public was less convinced that medical men posed no threat to their hypnotized subjects. As press accounts of doctors' assaults on hypnotized subjects confirmed, these anxieties were not unfounded. What is more, medical men had not reached consensus on the question of post-hypnotic suggestion and the hypnotist's ability to force the subject into criminal activity against his or her will. During the late 1880s and 1890s, as the debate on hypnotism and criminal activity reached its height in both the medical and mainstream presses, novels on the subjects of hypnotism and mesmerism were churned out in great numbers. That authors, like medical men, grappled with the relationship between the mysterious power of hypnotism and legitimate medical authority is rendered explicit in a sample of novel titles from this period: Doctor Caesar Crowl: Mind-Curer (1887); The Doctor's Secret (1890); Memoirs of a Physician (1890);

Hypnotised: or, The Doctor's Confession (1891); Dr. Mirabel's Theory: A Psychological Study (1893); The Hypnotic Experiment of Dr. Reeves and Other Stories (1894); A Bid for Fortune; or, Dr. Nikola's Vendetta (1895). These titles do not necessarily indicate if the eponymous doctors bend patients to their wills in a dangerous or criminal appropriation of hypnotism. They do, however, suggest that the practice of hypnotism and the profession of medicine were linked in the popular imagination, and that medical authority did not necessarily transcend the threatening potential for abuse that hypnotism was perceived to hold. Other titles, like The Slave of His Will (1891) and In His Grasp (1887), make clear the greatest fear about hypnotism among lay readers and the public at large: that the hypnotist possessed the power to control absolutely the hypnotized subject's actions and thoughts, banishing her will and replacing it with his own.

Late-Victorian popular fiction featuring hypnotism represents the figure of the hypnotist as a criminal, although novels tend to cast the hypnotist as either a charlatan seeking financial profit or a villain seeking control over his victims. Henry James's The Bostonians (1886) is a good example of the representation of the hypnotist as fraud. Although Verena Tarrant initially derives the strength boldly to address audiences on the subject of women's emancipation from the mesmeric passes that her father performs over her, the narrative explicitly reveals him as an old-fashioned huckster. The more common representation, however, is of the hypnotist as dangerous master of his victims' wills. In novels ranging from Esmé Stuart's In His Grasp (1887) to Richard Marsh's The Beetle (1897), the hypnotist is represented as a threatening, and often foreign, figure. In these novels, hypnotism figures variously as a powerful physiological and psychic phenomenon, a dubious practice with connections to the questionable rituals of

spiritualism, and an illegitimate means of bilking profit from vulnerable hypnotized subjects. Despite the differences in such representations of hypnotism, there remain generic continuities among the novels. That is, regardless of whether the author represents hypnotism as a legitimate and scientifically demonstrable practice, or as one more example of the charlatan's skills of *legerdemain* and suggestion, the novels share common features which distinguish them as an identifiable sub-genre of late-Victorian fiction. These features are most usefully described as a set of debates in which these novels participate: the question of the scientific legitimacy of hypnotism and who is authorized to determine this; the dangers posed by hypnotism, most notably to women who may be subjected to the hypnotist's will while they are in the hypnotic state; the relationship of hypnotism to contemporary fringe scientific practices such as spiritualism; and the characterization of the hypnotist. As my allusion to The Bostonians has already suggested, the question of the scientific legitimacy of hypnotism is undermined in novels, like James's, in which the hypnotist is revealed as no more than a glorified sideshow man. But even in such narratives, in which the hypnotist is ultimately revealed as a criminal cheat more akin to the professional medium than to a spiritual advisor or a medical man, the practice, possibilities, and potential danger of hypnotism often transcend the shabbiness of the ends that hypnotism is made to serve. Hypnotism is construed as a potentially dangerous tool that can subject its victims to crimes like theft of their property by charlatans or sexual assault of their persons by lascivious villains. It can also render them the instruments of crime willed by the hypnotist.

In what follows, I examine the representation of hypnotism and the hypnotist figure in a range of novels in order to suggest the force of stereotypes of the hypnotist with

which the medical profession had to contend as it debated the merits of hypnotism for therapeutic and scientific purposes. I want also to underscore that in none of these novels does the hypnotist suffer illegitimate accusations of criminal or sexual offences by his victims. As I have shown, medical men warned their brethren against unsubstantiated accusations or even seductions by hypnotized female subjects, recommending that doctors take precautions to avoid unsupervised contact with female subjects. Although the narrative of seduction or accusation of sexual interference by female subjects circulated with regularity in the medical press at the height of debates on hypnotism and criminality, there was no corresponding narrative in popular fiction of the same period. In fiction the hypnotist is invariably construed as the villain, whether as a charlatan interested in money or a villain interested in control, and the hypnotized subject is always construed as the victim. In fiction the medical profession's effort to promulgate a counter-narrative to enable the scientific investigation of hypnotism thus found its most intractable challenge.

Hypnotic Fictions

In Wilkie Collins's anti-vivisection novel Heart and Science (1882-83), the fragile heroine Carmina Graywell finds herself the unwilling object of the villainous Dr. Benjulia's gaze. "On the verge of hysteria," she "laughed loudly and wildly," until "Benjulia's eyes, silently questioning her again, controlled her at the critical moment" (244). She responds with ire, rebuffing his unwanted attentions. "'Don't look at me that way!'" she cries. "'It's your fault if I'm excited. It's your dreadful eyes that do it'" (245). This allusion to Benjulia's hypnotic power is merely a brief scene in a narrative the

ultimate aim of which Collins perceived as the condemnation of vivisection. Yet this conjunction of hypnotism and vivisection is important…

As one reviewer lamented of "hypnotic fiction," a term he coined to describe representations of hypnotism in fiction, the predictability of the genre was its shortcoming:

> For artistic reasons too obvious to need pointed out, the hypnotizer in these stories is always the villain of the piece. For the same or similar reasons, the 'subject' is always a person worthy of our sympathy, and is usually a woman. Let us suppose it to be a good and beautiful woman—for that is the commonest case. The author gives us to understand that by hypnotism this good and beautiful woman is for a while completely in the power of a man who is *ex hypothesi* a beast, and who *ex hypothesi* can make her commit any excesses that his beastliness may suggest. Obviously we are removed outside the moral order altogether; and in its place we are presented with a state of things in which innocence, honesty, love, and the rest are entirely at the disposal and under the rule of malevolent brutality, the result, as presented to us, being qualified only by such tact as the author may choose to display. (A.T.Q.C. 316)

In Herr Paulus: His Rise, His Greatness and His Fall (1888), Walter Besant traces the fortunes of a failed poet and author who achieves renown as a Prophet of Spiritualism in London after he is tutored in sleight of hand and mesmerism by a professional medium. Herr Paulus arrives at the home of the wealthy Augusta and Cyrus Brudenel, enthusiastic advocates of Spiritualism, and delights followers there with his "miracles": the manifestation of an Indian newspaper a month before its date of publication; his

prediction of a stock market crash that saves the family fortune; and his divination of the love between two of the secondary characters. What is more, Herr Paulus (an assumed name) captures the trust and admiration of the household, with the exception of two doubters: "by methods known only to himself he dominated those three women and made them all his slaves" (70). But the women are not the only slaves of his will. Indeed, remarks the skeptical Tom, "'He has conquered the whole house'" (78).

Herr Paulus (also known as Paul to his followers) achieves the requisite knowledge to wield such power in the household, we discover, by his hypnotism of patriarch Cyrus Brudenel:

> As he spoke he leaned over and met his pupil's eyes with his own, black and lustrous, commanding and compelling. In less than a minute, Mr. Brudenel's head bent forward, his face grew rigid, his eyes dilated, and his frame stiffened. Paul stood up and breathed deeply; then he pushed up an eyelid and looked at the glazed eye, as one who administers chloroform and wishes to ascertain if it has yet taken full effect. (88)

During Mr. Brudenel's daily hypnosis, Paul takes advantage of his state to open and read his mail, to peruse the documents in his desk, and thereby to apprise himself of useful information that will aid in Paul's self-representation as a communicator with the spirit world and a clairvoyant. When this routine is completed, he implants the suggestion that Mr. Brudenel has been visiting with other prophets in Abyssinia, and Brudenel awakes convinced of the reality of this experience. Only skeptics Tom and Sibyl worry about the extent of Paul's control over the household. Warns Tom, "'Your father forgets every day what he has said and done there [in Abyssinia]. Cicely sees her brother [presumed lost at

sea] as often as she wishes, by Paul's help. Hetty obeys if he lifts his little finger. This is a dangerous state of things, Sibyl. In the hands of an unscrupulous person it would be very dangerous. The man has opportunities which no one should be allowed to have'" (143). Fortunately for the Brudenel family, Paul is not "unscrupulous" but merely ambitious to achieve "'the glory of the new-made reputation'" (218). Much to the chagrin of his mentor, he sticks to the straight and narrow, refusing to use his hypnotic powers to advantage by stealing or otherwise making himself rich. When he becomes enamoured of Hetty and declares his love for her, he finds he can no longer influence others with the power of his piercing glances. His mentor, Professor Melchers, reprimands him, "'You have lost your power because you have neglected my warning, and suffered your mind to become wholly occupied with a woman'" (256). Paul refuses to be lured back into a life of deception and grifting. He rejects the offers of both Professor Melchers and Hetty's parents, who are themselves fraudulent mediums, to earn a living by participating in their spiritualist scams. Although Paul takes the moral high ground and abandons hypnotism and its associated practices altogether, Besant's conclusion to Herr Paulus suggests that Paul's role as prophet to the Brudenel's spiritualist circle has not been unique to him; it may be occupied by anyone who earnestly stakes a claim to it. Although Paul has confessed the fraudulence of his "miracles" and how they were performed, the Brudenels are not so much desperate to believe in the possibility of a spirit world as they are reluctant to give up their social sphere of influence among their fellow spiritualists. The novel ends with a scene that recreates precisely the scene of Paul's introduction into the Brudenel household. The same characters are present as invited guests when Princess

Olga Alexandrovna, a follower of Madame Blavatzky, proposes to dazzle them all with her connection to the spirits.

Besant's reference to Helena Petrovna Blavatsky, the founder of Theosophy, is intriguing for its topicality and its connection to Besant himself: Annie Besant, Walter's sister-in-law and a prolific author in her own right, joined the Theosophical Society in 1889 (the year after Herr Paulus was published), and eventually became the Society's president in 1907.[57] It is also worth remarking because of Besant's representation of hypnotism as part and parcel of a spurious set of practices that get lumped together under the rubric of "spiritualism." As Besant wrote in his Autobiography (1902), "Herr Paulus is a story of spiritualistic fraud – I have always rejoiced to think that the story was considered a great blow to Sludge and his friends" (209). This allusion to Robert Browning's poem indicates Besant's antipathy toward the spiritualist movement, a movement that had accrued greater legitimacy after the establishment, in 1882, of the Society for Psychical Research (SPR) by "a small group of highly educated intellectuals" (Owen 102). Although modern spiritualism claimed an altogether different genealogy than that of hypnotism, having been imported to Britain after the 1848 spirit rappings in upstate New York, the practices were just two among many that were conflated in the popular imagination by the 1880s. This conflation of such distinct practices and belief systems as spiritualism, hypnotism, and Theosophy was especially prevalent among sceptics, who sought to undermine the validity of these movements and the authority of their leading practitioners. As we have seen in Herr Paulus, this scepticism typified fictional representations of the hypnotist as fraud. And yet, despite Besant's explicit desire to expose the "spiritualistic fraud" of Paul and his ilk of ostensible mediums, the

novel endorses hypnotic phenomena as possible. Hypnotism functions as the viable explanation for Paul's knowledge of the seemingly unknowable details of Brudenel family finances. Paul is a successful fraud as a medium because he has mastered the practice of hypnotism; his real ability to hypnotize facilitates his feigned role as medium.

As were other fictional accounts of hypnotism, Herr Paulus was taken up by medical men. Two years after the novel's publication, physician and University of Edinburgh lecturer R.W. Felkin alluded to Besant's description of hypnotism in his monograph on Hypnotism, or Psycho-Therapeutics. Although Felkin was a proponent of medical investigations of hypnotism, he expressed concern about its possible adaptation to criminal ends. Felkin insisted that it was "surely the duty of professional and scientific men to face facts, and to . . .wrest [hypnotism] out of the hands of charlatans and quacks" (4). Nonetheless, he advocated caution in approaching hypnotism because it lent itself to the criminal abuse of hypnotized subjects who might be compelled, for example, to sign cheques or to commit forgery under the influence. "The description which Walter Besant has given in Herr Paulus is well borne out by facts" (50), he remarked. When Besant set out to discredit spiritualism, he perhaps little expected that his novel would provide fodder for medical claims to hypnotic investigations.

The title of The Charlatan (1895), by Robert Buchanan and Henry Murray, does not permit the reader any question about the nature of the main character's talents. Having wielded his critical pen against the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood in his notorious 1871 Contemporary Review article, "The Fleshly School of Poetry," Buchanan aimed, with the publication of this novel, to provide an explicit contribution to "the elimination of humbugs and charlatans from the ranks of the faithful" (n.p.). Although the "Note" at the

beginning of the novel insists that "'The Charlatan' is not an attack upon theosophy nor a satire against hypnotism" (n.p.), Theosophy and hypnotism certainly bear the brunt of Buchanan and Murray's satirical ire.[58] Woodville, a celebrated Theosophist and guest at the home of the Earl of Wanborough, is without doubt the charlatan of the title. Unlike the narrative strategy of Herr Paulus, which requires the reader to wait for several hundred pages before Paul's cheating ways are revealed, The Charlatan explains Woodville's imposture even before he arrives on the scene. In a sort of soliloquy, Madame Obnoskin, his partner in crime, reveals their plan to take advantage of the Earl. Woodville's plans also include revenging himself upon Isabel Arlington, the beautiful if relatively poor daughter of Colonel Arlington, who has gone missing in India. Isabel and Woodville share the secret of their past relationship in India. Although Isabel was then attracted to Woodville, her companions convinced her to reject him. As Woodville explains,

> Once I thought I had won her heart. Had I, indeed, done so, I would have been her servant, her slave, till life was done. Then, through the calumny of evil tongues, she learned to despise me. She drove me from her with insult. I pursued her; I accepted humiliation upon humiliation. Her door was closed in my face. My letters were returned unopened. At last, to avoid me, she came to England. I followed her; and I am here! (101-102)

Woodville's plans hit a snag, however, when he encounters Isabel one night, in a hypnotic trance. She has sleepwalked onto the terrace and from there wends her way to the turret room in which he is staying. When she admits, in her somnambulant state, that

she loves him, Woodville cannot bring himself to take ruthless advantage of her vulnerability:

> Aware of his evil command over her, he had expected to find himself face to face with a helpless, will-less woman, spell-bound beyond the power of resistance, physical or moral—a woman who, in her waking moments, felt for him nothing but distrust and even dread, and who, even when hypnotized and powerless to resist him, would be conscious only of a dull, numb sense of pain. How different was the reality! Had he been her dearest and nearest friend, instead of her most dangerous enemy, the sound of his voice could not have awakened in her a more subtle sense of pleasure. (163-64)

Moved by "the girl's perfect trust and utter surrender, her complete unconsciousness of any evil, her helplessness, her divine gentleness and affection" (167), Woodville packs her off to her own bedroom in an effort to avoid impugning her reputation.

Whereas Woodville's unrequited passion for Isabel renders him her "slave" in India, the tables are now turned and Isabel becomes a slave to his will. Woodville now possesses the means to press his advantage and take sexual license with his hypnotized subject, which he declines to do. That he decides not to avail himself of this opportunity does not render Murray's and Buchanan's representation of the hypnotist any less threatening. It is only the whim of the hypnotist, the narrative suggests, that determines the ultimate fate of the hypnotized subject and her virtue.

E.H.C. Oliphant's The Mesmerist (1890) dramatizes the danger that hypnotism could be adapted to criminal ends by forcing the hypnotized subject to commit crimes of which the subject remains unaware. The Mesmerist derives important circumstances of

plot and narrative techniques from The Moonstone (1868): just as the Verinder house is locked up tight as a drum the night the Moonstone is stolen, indicating that someone within the home is responsible for its disappearance, so too does the central mystery of The Mesmerist—the murder of Hugh Campbell—occur after the house has been secured for the evening; Sergeant Cuff's arrival on the scene to remedy Seegrave's ineptitude is echoed by Oliphant's introduction of Val Medway, friend of the accused and savvy amateur detective; and Allan Campbell's crime is committed unbeknownst to him while he is in a trance state. Like Collins's novel, The Mesmerist construes mesmerism as a dangerous and powerful tool in the wrong hands. As one of the characters wonders, "What crimes might not a man with such power make an unfortunate commit?" Even the murder of one's brother, the novel suggests, is made possible under the influence of mesmerism.

Whether these fictions represent the hypnotised subject as a successful opera diva, a gullible spiritualist, a naïve virgin, or a lovesick suitor, they are consistent in their representation of hypnotism as a dangerous tool in the hands of a villain. The diva and virgin alike are subject to the whims of the hypnotist, who holds the power to use the hypnotised subject to his own ends. What separates Svengali from Buchanan's and Murray's charlatan is moral conscience; whereas Svengali uses Trilby to fulfil his own musical aspirations (and, the narrator implies, his sexual desires), Woodville declines to seize sexual advantage of Isabel's trance state. That Isabel is not the object of sexual interference in no way diminishes the threat that hypnotism represents in these novels. Rather, it confirms the power that the hypnotist holds over his subject either to exploit or to respect the subject's

sexual or moral integrity. The exploitation of the hypnotised subject is similarly the common element in Herr Paulus and The Mesmerist. Although Besant set out to condemn spiritualism as a mere fraud perpetrated upon gullible victims, his novel posits hypnotism as a real phenomenon and the hypnotist as a real threat to the Brudenels' financial security. Paul is a charlatan as a spiritualist, but his hypnotic abilities are real. Just as real, if not more threatening, is the villainous Cecil Wilson's hypnotic power over Allan Campbell. This hypnotic power enables Wilson to command Allan's murder of his own brother and to keep the knowledge of this crime from Allan's waking conscience.

These four novels, among scores of others, provide various models of the hypnotist: as power-thirsty exploiter of vulnerable female subjects; as money-grubbing *faux* spiritualist; as vengeance-seeking charlatan; and as innocent-seeming, clandestine schemer. Regardless of the details of the authors' characterizations of the hypnotist, however, the broad strokes remain consistent. In each novel, the hypnotist is construed as a criminal—whether of the more petty, financial kind or of the sexually and morally exploitative kind. As my analysis of the mainstream and medical press coverage of hypnotism in the 1880s and 1890s has shown, the figure of the hypnotist was subject to similar suspicions of criminality in the press as well as in fiction. Medical proponents of hypnotism as a therapeutic responded by figuring medical men as the victims rather than the perpetrators of crime. They argued that unqualified practitioners, charlatans, and emotionally unstable female subjects were the genuine criminal threats in hypnotic treatments and demonstrations. This counter-narrative became necessary, I have

argued, because of the force of popular representations of the hypnotist as criminal. But it was also inadequate to the task of redeeming the figure of the hypnotist as a trustworthy, reliable medical expert. In none of the novels I have examined does the hypnotist face trumped up charges of sexual or moral exploitation. Although this was a story that circulated among medical men, it held little sway in the realm of fiction, where the hypnotist was consistently configured as a criminal. The power of these popular fictional representations of the hypnotist in the late nineteenth century at once made impossible the recuperation of the hypnotist by the medical community and made necessary the criminalization of the hypnotist's female subject. The medical community's turn away from hypnotism and its construction of the hypnotised female subject as a fraud remain as legacies of the power of these late-Victorian popular fictions.

What these fictional representations of the hypnotist ultimately suggest is how, in the absence of alternate models of the hypnotist, the repudiation of hypnotism became necessary for the consolidation of cultural authority that the medical profession coveted at the end of the nineteenth century. Hypnotism did not go away in the wake of the British Medical Association's 1893 failure to recognize it as a legitimate therapeutic. The clinical use of hypnotism continued after the turn of the century, most notably by doctors treating shell-shocked patients during the First World War, although it was largely overshadowed by psychoanalysis. What the late Victorian response of Ernest Hart and the medical profession to Trilby suggests, however, is the extent to which such clinical investigations of and interest in hypnotism were affected by popular representations of the hypnotist. The medical profession was not alone in its subjection to the power of

popular representation. As Aled Jones has remarked, mesmerism and hypnotism as metaphors for the influence of newspapers on readers had, by 1900, "long since acquired a particular, and an increasingly sinister, kind of resonance" (79). It has been the work of this chapter to make clear the development and consequences of the metaphoric resonances accrued by hypnotism at the *fin de siècle*.

---

[1] For further enjoyable anecdotes about prominent Victorians' interest in or abjuration of mesmerism in the 1830s and 1840s, see Bader.

[2] On mesmerism, see Winter and Parssinen. Winter indicates that the term "mesmerism" became "the dominant term of reference in England" (100) after the public "trials" of "animal magnetism" in 1838, when John Elliotson of University College Hospital held public demonstrations of the practice and its effects on his subjects, the O'Key sisters. Elliotson was forced to resign his post, and The Lancet began to use the term "mesmerism" rather than "animal magnetism" in the aftermath of his resignation. See pp. 32-108. On phrenology, see Jennifer Ruth. On homoeopathy, see Mark W. Weatherall. On spiritualism, see Jon Palfreman.

[3] The OED dates the use of "hypnotic" to denote a soporific from 1625. "Hypnosis" derives from "hypnose," the French for "morbid sleep." The reference to "nervous sleep" is from Gauld 281.

[4] In April 1886, for example, the British Medical Journal ran an article titled "Mesmerism, alias hypnotism" (654). And in 1893 Ernest Hart contributed a series of articles on "The New Mesmerism," in which he focused on recent developments in the study of hypnotism. Alison Winter remarks that hypnotism was "only one of a great many terms associated with at least a dozen related mesmeric practices" (185).

[5] For more on the Wakley/Elliotson debate and their eventual antagonism, see Winter 93-102 and Ruth 306-08.

[6] In The Medical Profession in Mid-Victorian England (Berkeley: U of California P, 1978), M. Jeanne Peterson remarks that there was no unity to the "medical profession" in early nineteenth-century medical life (6). I use the term here to indicate not only physicians, surgeons, and apothecaries who were licensed by the Royal College of Physicians, the Royal College of Surgeons, or the Society of Apothecaries, but also practitioners who underwent medical training and self-identified as medical practitioners. The use of the term is not unproblematic. As Jennifer Ruth points out, "Many of the same practitioners considered quacks by others saw themselves alongside the rank and file members as part of the persecuted group struggling against the monopoly of the Royal Societies" (301).

[7] The term "general practitioner" emerged between 1800 and 1830, but the term "doctor" was not universal until the end of the century. See Peterson, Medical Profession 1-39.

[8] In Mirror of Medicine: A History of the British Medical Journal, P.W.J. Bartrip notes that there were fewer members of the medical profession in 1881 than in 1841, but that the "medical profession began to increase its numbers only from the 1880s" (71). He

does not discuss the extent to which this comparison is problematized by the question of medical qualification that was on the agenda of medical reformers throughout this period.

[9] See especially "Precursors of the hypnotic movement" (273-96), "Hypnotism and scientific orthodoxy 1875-1885" (297-317), and "The Nancy school 1882-1892" (319-62).

[10] John Sutherland, in The Stanford Companion to Victorian Fiction, suggests that George Moore allegedly wrote parts of the novel. Linda Gerner Zatlin, in The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Novel, analyses the novel's anti-semitism (see pp. 97-105), but does not discuss Moore's involvement. In his recent biography, George Moore, 1852-1933, Adrian Frazier cites Moore on the extent of this "collaboration": "'I wrote none of Dr. Phillips—I invented the story and it was written under my direction, that was all'" (504). Moore, however, "arranged. . . for publication by Vizetelly in the 'One-volume Realistic Novel series" (Frazier 143).

[11] There is some evidence to support this interpretation. According to P.W. J. Bartrip, Julia Frankau knew Hart. Hart's wife died in November 1861 and an inquest determined that she had been "accidentally poisoned by tincture of aconite" which she had consumed in error in the middle of the night, mistaking it for a "black draught" (Bartrip, Mirror 78). However, a report in the Medical Times and Gazette suggested that Hart interfered with the attending doctors's recommendations to let the illness run its course by administering medicine to suppress her vomiting. See Bartrip, Mirror 77-79.

[12] In Mirror of Medicine, Bartrip states that "undoubtedly Hart has been the most controversial, powerful, and influential of the Journal's editors" (63), and describes him as "a brilliantly successful editor of the Journal, a hugely influential figure within the BMA, and a personality of major stature in the nineteenth-century medical world" (65). See also W.F. Bynum and Janice C. Wilson. In their discussion of nineteenth-century medical journals, Bynum and Wilson characterize Hart and Thomas Wakley of The Lancet as the two "great reforming editor[s] of the century" (38), rare in medical circles as "men who earned their living (or at least most of it) from their editorial work" (40).

[13] The following paragraph on Hart draws largely from Bartrip's meticulously documented history of the BMJ. It is also informed by the entries on Hart published in the Dictionary of National Biography Supplement, and Who Was Who, 1897-1916, Hart's obituary in The Times, and the lengthy obituary in the British Medical Journal.

[14] Hart continued as editor until his death in January 1898, with the exception of a twelve-month interruption in 1869-70 when he resigned. Although it is likely he did so because of the British Medical Association's concern about Journal finances and his increased spending on contributors, there was speculation that he hoped to avoid going to trial for murdering his wife.

[15] Bartrip notes that the annual Transactions of the Provincial Medical and Surgical Association (1833-53) preceded the PMSJ as the official publication of the PMSA. In 1840, "the PMSA's Council was receptive to the idea of supplementing it with a weekly journal" (Bartrip, "A Retrospect" 128).

[16] See Peterson and Ruth on the question of medical reform in the 1840s and 1850s.

[17] Because monthlies and quarterlies could only be issued through a London bookseller or through local secretaries, the PMSJ was issued weekly until 1847 in order to keep costs down. In 1847 the fortnightly publication of an enlarged PMSJ began and continued until

1853, when weekly issues resumed with the journal's editorial relocation to London. See Bartrip, Mirror 21-29.

[18] The original citation is BMJ, 24 Aug. 1855, 799.

[19] Bartrip, Mirror 71.

[20] After 1867, supporters of the CD Acts campaigned to extend the Acts to all large towns and seaports. The Harveian Society, of which Hart was the president in 1868, began this movement. After May 1870, the BMJ "maintained a steady stream of propaganda in favour of the Acts" and against their opponents" (Bartrip, Mirror 97). Infanticide gained public attention in the 1860s, especially after the publicized trial of Charlotte Winsor. G.K. Behlmer, in Child Abuse and Moral Reform in England 1870-1908 (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1982), identifies Hart as "'the person responsible for making tangible these hazy suspicions of foul play'" (qtd. in Bartrip, Mirror 99). According to Who Was Who, 1897-1916, the BMJ's reports on baby-farming led to the passing of the Infant Life Protection Act. Hart supported compulsory vaccination: one of his first leading articles, published in 1867 (the year of the Vaccination Act), supported vaccination, as did his 1880 pamphlet, "The Truth About Vaccination." He also took a staunch pro-vivisection position and was a personal friend of Burdon-Sanderson, whose 1873 Handbook for the Physiological Laboratory inaugurated the late Victorian vivisection controversy. See Susan Hamilton, "'Still Lives': Gender and the Literature of the Victorian Vivisection Controversy," Victorian Review 17.2 (1991): 21-34. Hart's support of vaccination and vivisection impeded his 1885 Parliamentary bid, in which he stood for election as a "radical" candidate in the predominantly working-class Mile End, where the dominant issue was Home Rule. See Bartrip, Mirror 93-120.

[21] Charcot's three "nervous states" of "le grand hypnotisme" (which he thought only developed among "the full-blown hysterical cases") were: "catalepsy," in which the subject is immobile but alert; "lethargy," in which the subject is in a state of sleep; and "induced somnambulism," in which the subject is in a state of "magnetic sleep" and hence suggestible. See Hart, "Schools and Doctrines of Hypnotism."

[22] Alan Gauld suggests that Charcot's interest and involvement in metallotherapy, the relief of hysterical anaesthesias by contact of the skin with metals, led to his interest in hypnotism since "a long tradition linked magnetic somnambulism with a sensitivity to the presence of metals" (310).

[23] See "Hypnotism in Switzerland," BMJ 11 June 1887: 1261; "Hypnotism in Portugal," BMJ 8 June 1889: 1328; "Exhibitions of Hypnotism," BMJ 17 Aug. 1889: 390.

[24] See "Social Estimation of the Profession," BMJ 25 Jan. 1879: 132; "Unqualified Assistants," BMJ 1 Feb. 1879: 175; "Legislation Concerning Midwives," BMJ 15 Mar. 1879: 393; "The Medical Council and Obscene Quackery," BMJ 31 May 1879: 823-24; "Retrogression and Hypnotism," BMJ 30 Aug. 1879: 346.

[25] For other examples of deaths from chloroform, see the following references in the BMJ: "A Death from Chloroform," 29 Mar. 1884: 627; "Liverpool. Death during Anaesthesia," 22 Dec. 1888: 1413-14. For examples of the use of hypnotism as an anaesthetic, see the following references in the BMJ: "Avulsion of Ingrowing Nail under Hypnotism," 15 Oct. 1887: 844; "Hypnotism as an Anaesthetic," 5 Apr. 1890: 801-2; "Hypnotism as an Anaesthetic in Surgery," 12 Apr. 1890: 849-50; "Hypnotism as an Anaesthetic," 19 Apr. 1890: 912; "Removal of Breast during Hypnotic Sleep," 20 Sep. 1890: 697-98. On the possible abuses of ether, see Ernest Hart, "An Address on Ether-

Drinking; Its Prevalence and Results. Delivered Before the Society for the Study and Cure of Inebriety," 18 Oct. 1890: 885-90.

[26] As Alison Winter has shown, chloroform became "the anaesthetic agent of preference" (184) only after mesmerism and ether were discarded in turn in favour of the next anaesthetic discovery.

[27] Based on the listing in the Subject Index of the Modern Works Added to the Library of the British Museum in the Years 1881-1900, ed. G.K. Fortescue (London: British Museum, 1903), it is likely that Potter was referring to the following titles: F. Bjornstrom, Hypnotism: Its History and Present Development, (New York: Humboldt, 1889); Jean-Martin Charcot, Clinical Lectures on Diseases of the Nervous System Delivered at the Infirmary of La Salpêtrière. III, (London: New Sydenham Society, 1889); James Braid, Observations on Trance: Or, Human Hybernation, (London: J. Churchill, 1850).

[28] The review of Herbert Beerbohm Tree's production of Potter's play first appeared as "The Hypnotism of 'Trilby,'" BMJ 2 Nov. 1895: 1117. The review was then appended to Hypnotism, Mesmerism and the New Witchcraft. A new edition enlarged. With chapters on 'the eternal gullible' and note on the hypnotism of 'Trilby', (New York: D. Appleton, 1896). It included chapters on "Hypnotism and Humbug," "Hypnotism, Animal Magnetism, and Hysteria," "Mesmerism and the New Witchcraft," "Gropings after the Supernatural," "'The Eternal Gullible,'" and an Appendix. This was a new edition of Hart's 1893 book, Hypnotism and the New Witchcraft.

[29] I am grateful to Sarah Cuthill and the friendly staff of the University of Bristol Theatre Collection for their expert assistance with these reviews and other materials.

[30] Frilby: An Operatic Burlesque was first produced at the Star Theater, Buffalo, New York, 25-27 April 1895.

[31] See Ernest Hart, "The Practices of Quacks. Collective Investigation. A Proposal by the Chairman of the Parliamentary Bills Committee," BMJ 14 Jul. 1894: 95; and "The Practices of Quacks. Collective Investigation," BMJ 21 Jul. 1894: 153.

[32] The metaphor of playing patients like instruments was employed earlier in the century by John Elliotson, who "claimed that he could 'play' the brain of a human being as musicians played a piano" (Winter 63). In 1843, Punch caricatured him playing the brain of a plebeian subject.

[33] Not only popular cultural representations but also contemporary accounts of medical experiments in hypnotism cast doctors as Svengali figures. Russian mathematician Sofia Kovalevskaya, for example, wrote about and published on her visits to the Charité and Salpêtrière hospitals in Paris, where she attended sessions by Charcot and his colleagues. She described Dr. Luys of the Academy of Medicine as "an Italian magician at a fair"—"if one looks at his nimble white hands, it seems that at any moment he might roll up his sleeves and start performing tricks with them." But her essays also represent these sessions as "radically theatrical interaction[s]" (7) in which "the doctor ends up looking like the dupe of his pet patients" (5), similar to Ernest Hart's arguments in "the New Mesmerism" series.

[34] Alan Gauld uses the terms "sceptics" and "moralizers" to identify two groups whose propagandizing significantly affected the decline of interest in hypnotism after the mid-1890s. See Gauld 561-67.

[35] According to the 12 Nov. 1888 Times Chambige was found guilty under extenuating circumstances and sentenced to "seven years' penal servitude" ("Foreign" 6). On 3

January 1889, however, the newspaper reported, "In consequence of the delicate health of Henri Chambige, the Algerian murderer, his sentence of seven years' hard labour and transportation has been commuted to one of five years' simple imprisonment" ("France" 5).

[36] The case was also referred to in the mainstream British press as the Gouffé case, after the name of Eyraud's and Bompard's victim. For trial coverage, see "Latest Intelligence. The Gouffé Murder." Times 17 Dec. 1890: 5; "The Gouffé Murder." Times 18 Dec. 1890: 3; "The Gouffé Murder," Times 19 Dec. 1890: 3; "The Gouffé Murder," Times 20 Dec. 1890: 5; "Latest Intelligence: The Gouffé Murder," Times 22 Dec. 1890: 5; "France," Times 28 Jan. 1891: 5; "France," Times 29 Jan. 1891: 5; "France," Times 30 Jan. 1891: 5; "France," Times 8 Feb. 1891: 5; "Latest Intelligence. Lyons," Times 11 Feb. 1891: 5.

[37] Harris describes the conflict between the Salpêtrière and Nancy schools as "a conflict between the rival medical and philosophical perspectives of epiphenomenalism and ideodynamism" (Harris 204). She identifies Charcot as an epiphenomenalist because of his commitment to understanding hypnosis in neurophysiological terms and Bernheim as a self-avowed adherent of ideodynamism, a term he coined to describe his approach to hypnotism and his belief that hypnosis altered the hypnotized subject's organic state. For more on the controversy, see Hillman.

[38] According to Charcot, lethargy was the most dangerous state for female subjects because it was in this state they would be vulnerable to sexual assault. In the state of somnambulism, the subject would be unable to resist obeying the commands of the hypnotist and might, therefore, commit criminal acts orchestrated by the hypnotist. See Harris, 206-07.

[39] For a heated exchange on the issue of criminal responsibility of the insane, see "Criminal Responsibility," Times 4 Sep. 1894: 10; "Criminal Responsibility," Times 8 Sep. 1894: 12; "Criminal Responsibility," Times 14 Sep. 1894: 10; "Criminal Responsibility," Times 19 Sep. 1894; "Criminal Responsibility," Times 1 Oct. 1894: 2.

[40] For articles on the "Dangers of Hypnotism," see, for example, British Medical Journal, 17 Sep. 1887 and 28 Mar. 1891.

[41] On Braid and his theory of hypnotism, see Winter 184-85 and Gauld 279-87.

[42] Anne Harrington has argued that rather than marking a definitive break with earlier theories on mesmerism and animal magnetism, late nineteenth-century medical investigation of hypnotism actually gave rise to "a reawakening of interest in the fundamental ideas of biomagnetism as taught by the old mesmerists" (227).

[43] For a more detailed description of Elliotson's experiments, see Winter and Bader.

[44] Mesmerism had been connected to spiritualism earlier in the century because of the claims many believers in mesmerism made about the mesmerized subject's capacity for clairvoyance. In 1880 the Times reiterated this connection, noting that hysterical women, such as those at the Salpêtrière, "constitute the great majority . . . of so-called mediums and clairvoyant persons" ("Modern Demoniacs" 8).

[45] See also "Hypnotism," Lancet 6 Aug. 1887; "Masturbation Cured by Hypnotism," Supplement to the BMJ 4 July 1891; C. Lloyd Tuckey, "The Value of Hypnotism in Chronic Alcoholism" BMJ 27 Aug. 1892: 459-60; George M. Robertson, "The Use of Hypnotism Among the Insane" BMJ 27 Aug. 1892: 460; "Hypnotism as a Therapeutic Agent," BMJ 6 May 1893: 954; "Hypnotism in Dipsomania," BMJ 13 Mar. 1897: 702;

Rev. of The Use of Hypnotism in Chronic Alcoholism by C. Lloyd Tuckey, BMJ 10 Apr. 1897: 923. For an extended analysis of hypnotism's untapped therapeutic potential in medical treatment, see R.W. Felkin, Hypnotism, or Psycho-Therapeutics (Edinburgh and London: Young J. Pentland, 1890). Felkin's book consists of material originally published in the Edinburgh Medical Journal. For a review of Felkin, see BMJ 27 June 1891.

[46] Efforts had been made earlier in the century to demonstrate the veracity and usefulness of mesmerism by calling upon the mesmerized subject's capacity for clairvoyance. Perhaps the most famous and successful mesmerized clairvoyant was the Seeress of Bolton who, in 1849, helped to ascertain the whereabouts of some missing banknotes and to reveal the identity of a thief. See Dingwall, "Hypnotism," 120.

[47] Robin Waterfield addresses the question of will throughout his recent book on the subject of hypnotism. He notes, "even a deeply hypnotized subject is not wholly unconscious, and can resist the suggestions of the hypnotist if they are too outrageous or transgress the subject's ingrained moral code" (Waterfield 225). In the late-Victorian period, as I am arguing, the subject's capacity for resistance to the will of the hypnotist was precisely the key question for medical men and laypeople alike.

[48] The application of various medicines and stimulants continued in medical experiments throughout the 1880s and 1890s. The Lancet's Paris correspondent recorded his skepticism about a series of experiments at the Academy of Medicine in which "stimulating agents" in tubes—including morphine, strychnine, valerian, sparteine, Indian hemp, coffee, and alcohol—were placed at the nape of the subject's neck. The subject's reactions invariably corresponded with the anticipated results, alcohol inducing "an irresistible sleepiness, staggering, heaviness of the head, moderate and agreeable intoxication, and vomiting" (548) and so on. The correspondent remarked, "if the experimenters think that the application of their tubes and the symptoms which follow have a relation of cause and effect, they are, of course, entitled to that belief. But in my opinion the experiments are carried on in the very worst possible conditions for a scientific test . . . . I have seen the operator guilelessly whisper to a visitor that such and such an effect would be produced, apparently unaware of the fact that in the hypnotic condition there is a state of hyperacousia which makes the faintest sound audible" ("M. Luys and Hypnotism" 548).

[49] Later in the year, the BMJ reviewer of Reguier's Hypnotisme et Croyances Anciennes concurred "that although the uses of hypnotism for criminal purposes are capable of demonstration as *expériences de laboratoire*, it is doubtful if any crime has been proved to have taken place under its influence" (16 May 1891).

[50] See also the letter from Kingsbury, 14 Feb. 1891 warning of demonstrations by Dr. Vores," ostensibly a colleague of Luys and Charcot. Kingsbury notes, "In Manchester one of the most attractive features of the shows was a demonstration of how he could induce a subject to steal or commit murder."

[51] For more on the Lévy case, see Harris 217-19; Pick 146; and Bryan 156-57.

[52] The Chicago Medico-Legal Society recommended that the practice of hypnotism be limited to medical men and used "only in the presence of other practitioners or undoubted friends of the person operated upon." See "Hypnotism in America."

[53] This was not the first time that Lilly had lamented the decline of late-Victorian moral values. See "The New Naturalism," a critique of Zola's fiction.

[54] For a similar critique of the reformation of incarcerated criminals by means of clinical treatment, see Simpson. He writes, "Meanwhile the Elmira system, with its lectures and discussions, its Turkish baths, massage and gymnastics for prisoners, its reading clubs, its daily newspaper, its careful avoidance of everything that may hurt a sensitive prisoner's feelings, or remind him that he has done anything to be ashamed of, must inevitably tend to diminish, on the one hand, the deterrent effect of legal penalties, and on the other hand to encourage hypocrisy, self-deceit and a very disagreeable kind of priggishness among the criminals" (103).

[55] Harris notes that "Chambige was a promising new member of the decadent school of literature who had written an article on 'les Goncourt et l'exotisme'" ("Murder" 222).

[56] For the text of the National Vigilance Association's pamphlet titled "Pernicious Literature," see Becker 351-52. This genre of literature cut a wide swath, including, for example, "penny dreadfuls," a term newly adapted in the 1870s to describe "boys' periodicals of the lowest stratum" (Dunae 134) "alleged to have encouraged anti-social attitudes and criminal behavior in the young" (Dunae 133). As Martin Wiener explains, the question of juvenile offenders' criminal responsibility and strategies "to protect the young from moral contamination" (Wiener 132) concerned penal reformers throughout the century. See Wiener, "Juveniles," Reconstructing the Criminal, 131-41. On the relationship between the penny dreadful and crime, see Dunae and Springhall. On the increasing preoccupation with juvenile criminals and the question of appropriate punishment in the late-Victorian period, see, for example, Times 17 Feb. 1880: 9; "Juvenile Criminals," Times 19 Feb. 1880: 11; "Juvenile Offenders," Times 1 Sep. 1894: 11; "Juvenile Offenders," Times 4 Sep. 1894: 8.

[57] I have been able to locate no reference to Besant's opinions of Annie Besant or her involvement in Theosophy either in his autobiographical writings or in the standard biographical sources. The antipathy between them is suggested, however, in Elaine Showalter's recent edition of All Sorts and Conditions of Men (1882), Walter Besant's novel about life in London's East End. A note contends, "The pronunciation of Besant's name has occasioned some confusion. Besant was so determined to dissociate himself from the activities of his sister-in-law Annie Besant, the theosophist and Fabian activist, that he changed the pronunciation of his own surname from *Be*sant (rhyming with 'crescent') to Be*sant* with the accent on the second syllable" (n.p.).

[58] The character of Mervyn Darrell serves as the satirical butt of another bugbear: aestheticism. As Lottie Deepdale points out to Mervyn, "'At college you had the aesthetic scarlatina, and babbled about lilies, and sunflowers, and blue china'" (18). Darrell is clearly, to my mind, modeled on Oscar Wilde. Consistent with the public perception of Wilde, Mervyn abhors Dickens, speaks in paradoxes, and enjoys "'the sharp, acute spasm of artistic agony, the aroma of social decay, for out of these comes Literature, which is Life'" (21).

Chapter Four
Staging Identity:
The Role of Svengali in the Late-Victorian Theatre

The 5 November 1895 program of the Grand Opera House in London, Ontario provides the cast list and plot synopsis for the evening's presentation. On that Tuesday, theatre-goers in London were treated to a performance of D'Ennery's "Monbars," featuring the "Engagement of the Famous Romantic Actor, Robert Mantell." Readers of the program, however, did not have to be particularly assiduous in their perusal to note also the upcoming weekend production of Trilby at the same theatre. Billing it as "the latest and most successful play of the Century," the Opera House included a half-page advertisement for Friday and Saturday evening performances of Trilby, as well as a Saturday matinee. "First time here since its ENORMOUS TRIUMPH in New York, Chicago, Boston and Toronto," the advertisement enthused, "TRILBY dramatized by Paul M. Potter from Du Maurier's famous novel and performed by A.M. Palmer's Unrivaled Company is better than the book!" This "Grand Production of 'Trilby'" could be viewed for the price of a ticket, which ranged from 25¢ to $1.50. Everyone in town ought to hie themselves to the theatre, the "Special Notice of Trilby" recommended:

> The A.M. Palmer Company played in New York, Boston and Chicago for over seven hundred times to the largest and most fashionable audiences ever gathered together in those great cities. The production in London will be marked with all the magnificence which characterized it in the east, beautiful special scenery, superb costumes, original music and dances, will be presented here exactly as they were in the large cities mentioned. This will be the only visit of 'Trilby,' as it goes on tour to all the large cities, before again reaching New York. Therefore, the thousands

who have read Du Maurier's celebrated novel, together with the thousands who have not done so, will, no doubt, assemble on the above dates, to witness Paul M. Potter's wonderful dramatization of this charming and entrancing book.

The 5 November program was not the first indication of theatre-goers' familiarity with "The Sensation of the Age," as the Opera House dubbed Trilby in its advertising for the stage production. Since 13 May 1895, the Opera House programs had featured, in a regular section of amusing anecdotes and one-liners, short jokes about Trilby generally and artist's models specifically.[1] In addition, Milne, Spittal and Company, a local millinery, advertised the arrival of "new hats" by singling out the "Trilby Block and Dunlap Style in all colors just to hand" for special mention.[2] So successful were A.M. Palmer's November productions in London that the company returned in February 1896 to reprise their performances. The Opera House program series indicates that this "Grand Production of 'Trilby' dramatized from Du Maurier's celebrated novel, by Paul M. Potter, by arrangement with Harper Brothers" returned for a "Special Engagement" on Wednesday, 26 February 1896. The cast list identified new actors to interpret the roles of Taffy, Svengali, and Mrs. Bagot. The appeal of the production for local businesses, however, remained consistent, judging on the basis of advertisements in the program. In both the November 1895 and February 1896 programs, Johnston's chose to advertise their "Stylish Footwear" immediately below the cast list. Perhaps taking advantage of the play's emphasis on Trilby's left foot, these advertisements featured a shoe on a foot in profile. And, in the February 1895 program, Graham Brothers, Hatters and Furnishers, similarly advertised the "latest stiffs and fedoras" above the cast list, perhaps hoping to capitalize on the merchandising in Trilby fedoras that the play had spawned.

By November 1895, when Palmer's production of Trilby appeared on the boards in London, Ontario, the stage adaptation of Du Maurier's novel had been delighting North American audiences for eight months. Paul Potter, the author of the stage adaptation, was prompted to write his script after reading a copy of Du Maurier's novel. Potter explained in a May 1895 interview that he purchased a copy of Trilby from a book-stall in the Waldorf Hotel, intending to send it to a friend. He became so engrossed in the book, however, that he read it straight through and decided to dramatize it. As the house dramatist at Palmer's Theatre in Boston, a position which playwright Dion Boucicault had held before him, Potter was immediately drawn to the novel's dramatic potential. Potter's adaptation premiered in a production by A.M. Palmer's company at the Boston Museum on Monday, 4 March 1895. According to J.B. and J.L. Gilder's Trilbyana (1895), the adaptation "achieved so great a success that several companies were immediately put upon the road to play it throughout the country" (8). Indeed, Potter mentions in his May 1895 interview three distinct provincial companies that were by then touring the United States and Canada, including the company, featuring Mabel Amber as Trilby, which performed in London, Ontario.

These celebratory narratives of Trilby's inevitable triumph on the stage obscure the trepidation with which the initial Boston production was mounted. Despite the popularity of the novel, those associated with the initial stage production did not consider the stage adaptation a risk-free undertaking. As a journalist later explained in 1905, there existed some "dread of ridicule" at the moment of the original 1895 production:

> The late A.M. Palmer had lost prestige and fortune at the theatrical game of chance, and was ready to try almost anything for a change of luck; but Paul Potter's idea of

> a "Trilby" dramatization seemed a play that could hardly win. Making a great singer out of an unwilling novice by keeping her in a hypnotic trance might be amusing as a joke on mental phenomena, but could it be made a sane proposition in a serious drama? [. . .] Palmer's stage director Eugene Presbley was to give the word to turn the tragedy into a comedy if the audience began to laugh at the hypnotism, but no such course became necessary, and the experiment enriched Palmer sufficiently to postpone his bankruptcy several years. He decided to reap the harvest before the grain had time to spoil in the field. Who knew how short the Trilby fad might be? Within a month twelve companies were on as many routes, every one connected with the affair profiting richly. The royalty paid by him was 10% of the gross receipts, of which 4% went to the publishers of the novel, Harper and Brothers, and 3% each to Potter and Du Maurier. I don't suppose that as much money has ever been made with any other play in a single year. (14 May 1905, unnamed article in scrapbook)

In this chapter, I explore the reasons for the enormous popularity of Trilby on stage. Given the overwhelming success of the novel in both serial and book forms, it would be easy to ascribe the stage version's popularity to the already established popularity of the novel. The nervousness with which Palmer's stage director and company anticipated the audience's reception of the play at its opening night, however, suggests that the play's success was not guaranteed. What, then, were the conditions in which Trilby emerged not only as a touring success on the North American theatre circuit, but also as a star vehicle for Herbert Beerbohm Tree, whose production of the play was so lucrative that it single-handedly financed the construction of a new theatre building in London (Her Majesty's

Theatre) for his production company? In analysing Tree's adaptation of Trilby, which was based on Potter's script but included additional material inserted by Tree, I pay particular attention to two factors: first, Svengali's displacement of Trilby as the story's primary character, a displacement that was widely noted by theatre reviewers at the time; and second, Tree's characterization of Svengali, which drew on then-current stage and artistic conventions for representing Jewish characters. In contrast to critics who have considered Tree's stage adaptation merely part and parcel of "the Trilby phenomenon" as a whole, I want here to historicize Tree's production generally and his depiction of Svengali specifically in relation to both racial stereotypes prevalent at the *fin de siècle* and changing modes of theatrical production in the 1880s and 1890s.

In a stunning article on Jewish stereotypes and *fin de siècle* melodrama, Shearer West has argued that Tree's Svengali draws on an array of nineteenth-century artistic and stage conventions for representing sterotypes of "the Jew." Tree's characterization of Svengali, she contends, occurred at a moment when the figure of "the Jew" on stage underwent a shift, from his vilification in the waning genre of melodrama to his humorous objectification in a newly emergent form of comedy. Drawing on West's meticulous scholarship, this chapter broadens her focus on melodrama to examine changes occurring at the structural level of theatrical organization as yet another important factor in Tree's adaptation of Trilby. Alternative theatrical organizations, like the Independent Theatre Society and Elizabeth Robins's theatre co-operative, posed ideological challenges to the actor-manager system at the same time that the increasing popularity of variety houses and music halls posed material challenges by luring middle-class audiences away from theatres whose productions were endorsed by the Lord

Chamberlain's Examiner of Plays. In addition, as Holbrook Jackson has pointed out, the new theatrical movement which advocated drama dealing with sexual and gender relations in a frank manner was highly critical of the hegemony of the actor-manager system. Jackson terms this a movement for the "higher drama" because it catered to an elite audience of cultural sophisticates. Despite the limited audience reach of the new drama, its advocates nonetheless wielded considerable cultural capital and influence in the periodical press as writers and critics. The new movement's "chief material objects of attack were the dominance of the actor-manager and his demand for plays written around himself, and the general theatrical custom of seeking only plays that promised a 'long run'" (Jackson 212).

Tree's production of Trilby aptly exemplifies this criticism, particularly given Tree's refashioning of Potter's adaptation to highlight the role of Svengali for himself. Rather than emphasizing the novel's engagement with questions of gender, which were similarly under scrutiny in plays by Ibsen and in adaptations of naturalist writers like Zola, Tree's production of Trilby explicitly focussed on the vilification and racialization of Svengali. As Daniel Pick has argued, Tree's characterization of Svengali drew on stereotypes of the dangerous, hypnotizing Jew. This emphasis on Svengali's hypnotic powers, however, also drew on the stereotype of the villainous hypnotist that I have discussed in Chapter Three, implicitly calling to audiences' minds the public debates about hypnotism and the figure of the hypnotist. Tree's production of Trilby may not have dealt with sexual and gender matters in the frank way advocated by proponents of the new theatre movement, but his highlighting and expanding of the novel's hypnotic theme freighted it with rich sexual connotations for an audience well schooled by the

popular press in debates about the sexual agency of hypnotized subjects. In these ways, Tree exploited popular debates about both hypnotism and the Jewish Question in fashioning his stage characterization of Svengali.

The popular success of Tree's production brought him fame as "the leading actor-manager of his generation" (Schulz 231) and its financial success consolidated this reputation by making possible the construction of a new theatre for his company—a theatre that was at once "a monument to the actor-manager who built it" and "a monument to the fusion of conspicuous consumption and the prestige of the ruling bloc" which was an important constituency of his audience (Schulz 231). The success of Tree's production of Trilby contributed to his ability to locate himself advantageously in the rapidly evolving late-Victorian theatre by underwriting financially his efforts to construct Her Majesty's Theatre and to produce lavish, expensive productions that could compete in the theatrical marketplace. Tree continued to draw on his tried-and-true adaptation of Trilby well beyond the turn of the century as its popularity continued to pay the bills on provincial tours. The contradictions implicit in Beerbohm Tree's career in the 1890s generally and in his production of Trilby specifically, however, suggest the instability of the figure of the actor-manager at the end of the nineteenth century. Despite the critical and pecuniary success of men like Tree, Henry Irving, and George Alexander, the contradictions I trace here measure the cultural work required of such successful actor-managers in mediating between a commitment to art and a commitment to box office revenues, between residual dramatic forms like melodrama, with their reliance on stock characters like the villainous Jew, and emergent forms like the Society play, with their emphasis on frank depictions of relations between the sexes.

The Actor-Manager and the New Drama

Director-manager William A. Brady attended the first performance of Potter's Trilby in Boston. As "the first manager after Mr. Palmer to see the worth of the play and predict its vogue" (New York World, 115), he sought Palmer before the final curtain and, according to the New York World, paid Palmer $10,000 U.S. for the American touring rights for the play. This first American tour of Trilby coincided with Tree's 1895 American tour. While Tree's company was performing in Philadelphia, Tree dispatched his half-brother Max Beerbohm to report on Potter's stage adaptation of the novel, then playing in the same city. Max reported later that evening that Potter's adaptation was "the greatest nonsense" (Bingham 71) and predicted its failure in London, should someone purchase the English rights to the production.

From 15 April to 12 October 1895, Trilby enjoyed an uninterrupted run at the Garden Theater in New York City. On the evening of the first performance in April, hundreds of people were turned away at the door for lack of room in the theatre. Herbert Beerbohm Tree was not among the unlucky enthusiasts and would-be audience members. Having secured a ticket for the performance of Trilby during its five-day run at the Garden Theater, Tree went on to secure the English rights to the play after seeing only the first two acts. As I have suggested, Tree's purchase of the English rights was professionally savvy in the extreme: his production of Trilby would ultimately provide the financing necessary to build a new theatre from the ground up and to move his company from the Haymarket into this new building in 1897.

Tree's professionalism as manager of his company, however, stood in stark opposition to his professed disdain for the professionalization of acting. Like his

penchant for romantic melodrama, Tree held dear a romantic notion of acting. His ideas on the subject seem blatantly anti-intellectual in their denigration of acting instruction and their emphasis on innate imagination. As George Taylor has remarked, Tree regarded acting technique as "a necessary chore, while sensibility was the key to real acting" (Taylor 170). Tree lectured the Royal Institution on the subject of acting in 1893 and subsequently published this lecture as The Imaginative Faculty, a piece in which he lauded the innocence of childhood as the exemplary state of sensibility to which actors ought to aspire:

> Acting, in fact, is purely an affair of the imagination.... Children are born actors. They lose the faculty only when the wings of their imagination are weighted by self-consciousness. It is not everyone to whom is given the capacity of always remaining a child. It is a blessed gift of receptive sensibility which it should be the endeavour (the unconscious endeavour perhaps) of every artist to cultivate and to retain. (qtd. in Taylor 170).

In this formulation Tree imagines the ideal actor as a sensitive vehicle for the transmission of imagination. The language of this description of the ideal actor is markedly similar to the language of hypnotism: the actor is like a good hypnotic subject—suggestible, receptive, and able to channel the imagination as the subject channels the will of the hypnotist. Ideal actors are born, not made, insisted Tree. They spring, Athena-like, from the head of Zeus, and instruction serves only to diminish their powers. Tree even went so far as to decry "the pernicious habit of reading books" (qtd. in Bingham) and the pursuit of a university education as two activities detrimental to the actor's development as an artist.[3] This romantic conception of the actor at once explains

Tree's approach to his acting generally and the role of Svengali specifically, and contrasts the care with which he nursed the company's productions in the 1880s and 1890s. It also belies Tree's studied choice of productions and his attention to audience desire as a market force in the late Victorian theatre.

By the mid-1890s, Tree regularly received unsolicited manuscripts from leading and less known playwrights who had drafted plays with substantial parts written especially for him. A royal invitation to Balmoral, where Tree and company performed for the Queen and her entourage in September 1894, confirmed Tree's prominence and popularity on the British stage.[4] Plays capitalizing on this popularity, born of Tree's considerable skill at characterization, seemed a surefire way to create a hit and to earn revenue for Tree, his company, and the playwright. Plays which had staying power and which ran for more than three months would guarantee large profits for these stakeholders. Given this dual necessity—to capitalize on his popularity and to guarantee profit by ensuring a long run—it is unsurprising that Tree, like other actor-managers of the period, was drawn to scripts that provided ample stage time for himself.

Not all theatre critics and workers were enamoured of such productions, however. In the early 1890s, "the actor-manager question" erupted in the periodical press as critics, playwrights, and actor-managers themselves debated the merits of a system that had propelled the English Victorian theatre since the days of Macready and Kean. In prominent journals like the Fortnightly Review and the Nineteenth Century, proponents and detractors of the actor-manager question publicly butted heads.

Playwright Henry Arthur Jones was an articulate opponent of the actor-manager system. Adducing a logic perhaps adapted from John Stuart Mill's argument against the

mindless inheritance of received ideas, Jones refuted Bram Stoker's "contention . . . that English human theatrical nature has—to use his own simile—inevitably crystallized itself in the actor-manager, that he is the elect of destiny, and that it is useless to 'carp at natural laws which fix direction as well as strength in the resultant of multitudinous forces'" (Jones 6). Jones wittily refused Stoker's suggestion that the actor-manager was "the only and inevitable form of crystallization that the modern drama will take":

> When I was at school, the human nature in some of us boys crystallised itself in the direction of robbing a neighbour's orchard, but a severe application of the birch at once uncrystallised us, and the phenomenon of crystallisation did not take place again that season. When human nature tends to crystallise itself in undesirable forms, surely the only thing to do is to set to work and uncrystallise it. (Jones 6)

Jones enumerated six "vital points at issue" (Jones 6), the primary question being, "Is the present overwhelming predominance of the actor-manager a hindrance to the development of a literary and intellectual drama?" (Jones 7). In Jones's compelling argument, the tug-of-war "between the authority of the actor-manager and the authority of the author" (Jones 7) was a detriment to the quality of English drama.[5] Ultimately the actor-manager held sway, Jones complained, because he could not afford to play secondary parts; the theatre-going public would not pay to see him in anything other than a star vehicle. This "undue prominence" (Jones 15) of the actor-manager Jones identified as a condition of theatrical production that must be abolished if English drama was to progress in an original intellectual direction.

Of the five commentaries on the actor-manager system published in June and July 1891—by Jones, Bram Stoker, Henry Irving, Charles Wyndham, and Tree—Jones's and Wyndham's contributions are the most sophisticated analyses. Although Jones and Wyndham differ in their positions on the question (Jones is a critic of the system and Wyndham is a defender of it), what their analyses of the system share is the language of political economy and of the marketplace. Whereas Tree's support of the actor-manager system relies on purplish prose and a histrionic style, Jones's and Wyndham's analyses rely on a vocabulary that evokes not the stage but the stock exchange.

Identifying himself as "a member of the assailed class" (Wyndham 1054)—those supporters of the actor-manager system who, somewhat disingenuously, feel themselves in the minority—Wyndham proceeds with an analysis of theatre management as a business like any other. He reconfigures the actor-manager's choice of plays with prominent roles for himself as a savvy business decision rather than a sign of his arrogance and self-importance. The most valuable capital of the actor-manager is "his own talents as an actor, and his personal influence with the public" (Wyndham 1055).[6] Like the "theatre, the furniture, the scenery, dresses and appointments of the stage," the actor-manager's talents and personal influence are "assets" to be safeguarded and exploited in the service of professional advancement and financial security (Wyndham 1055). Misconstrued as "an oppressor and a 'sweater' of talent" (Wyndham 1057), the actor-manager is a rare combination of businessman and artist; as such, he is far superior to the mere "speculator" as an employer of actors (Wyndham 1056). What some actors perceive as "oppression" is nothing more than "the salutary experience of what the indictment calls 'being crushed'" (Wyndham 1057). With age comes the actor's ability to

understand this experience not as oppression but as an enforced discipline to be valued. Wyndham thus frames his argument for the maintenance of relations of production among actors, playwrights, and actor-managers as a hermeneutic impasse. Actors and critics of the actor-manager system misunderstand the motivations for the actor-manager's actions, attributing them to individual character traits—arrogance, self-importance—rather than to the market system in which the actor-manager must operate.

Whether advocating or deriding the actor-manager system, the most compelling analyses in this series of commentaries on the actor-manager system mobilize the same language of political economy and the marketplace yet arrive at opposite assessments of the system. Jones concludes that the public's demand for character-driven dramas impels the actor-manager's supply of the same. In order to promote the development of a new, intellectual English theatre, argues Jones, experiments with new forms of theatrical organization must be undertaken. If the hegemony of the actor-manager system is disrupted, then audience tastes may be reeducated to support the emergence of a higher drama. For Jones, multiplying the forms of theatrical organization and therefore different kinds of theatrical productions could diminish the cult of the actor-manager and could promote the development of a superior English drama. For Wyndham, to the contrary, the actor-manager, in his selection of plays and his theatrical management, responds to audience desire for high quality productions starring talented actors. The actor-manager aims for aesthetic and financial success. Aesthetic success is nowhere defined in either commentary, but it is clear that Jones and Wyndham assume different positions on the subject. Whereas Wyndham appears to equate audience approbation with aesthetic success, Jones makes clear that these are not commensurate measures.

It is precisely this question—what constitutes or should constitute aesthetic success on the English stage?—that underpins debates on the actor-manager system. And the implicit response to this question for proponents of the system like Wyndham and Tree is that pecuniary success *is* aesthetic success. That is, pecuniary success implies aesthetic success, as aesthetic success guarantees box office returns. Tree nowhere in his contribution to the series of commentaries makes explicit this equation. He does, however, emphasize the actor-manager's commitment to art, citing "a leading French actor" who complains of the perfunctoriness of French theatre compared to the artistry of the English stage: "'No wonder you English are able to produce such artistic work, for your actors are your managers. With us, in Paris, our managers are mere tradesmen, who have no care for the claims of art; this is an intolerable evil, against which our actors are at present in open revolt'" (Tree 17-18). Tree uses the earnest language of art and artistic inspiration to avoid implicating the actor-manager in the marketplace. To implicate himself in the marketplace invoked by Jones and Wyndham would be to risk laying bare how financial success is a necessary consideration in the actor-manager's selection of plays. Art provides Tree with an alibi in his disavowal of market conditions and his repudiation of other models of theatrical organization.

It was not only in public venues like his Fortnightly Review commentary that Tree professed disinterest in financial matters. As biographers Hesketh Pearson and Madeleine Bingham have noted, Tree paradoxically managed to become "the last of the great actor-managers" (Pearson 71) even though he was "a poor man of affairs" (Pearson 114). Indeed, notes Pearson, "he had as little practical capacity as a man can have without being run over by a steam-roller in the street or having his watch stolen while winding it

up" (Pearson 114). In Tree's ostensible absence of financial savvy, Pearson ascribes his success to his unrivalled talent on the stage and to the band of loyal employees who worked behind the scenes to ensure the smooth running of the theatre. Not one to economize, Tree occasionally frustrated his business and bank managers with his apparently nonchalant attitude toward production financing and his generosity with actors. He was quick to provide walk-on work for down-and-out actors, for example, putting them on salary and refusing to castigate them for dissipation or insolvency. Concludes Pearson, his staff "would do everything for him because he could do nothing for himself" (Pearson 114).

Pearson's assessment does not consider the cultural work performed by Tree's insistence on the actor-manager's art and his disavowal of interest, or interestedness, in the marketplace. I have argued in Chapters One and Two that the professional identities of writers and artists relied for their consolidation on the disavowal of the literary marketplace on the one hand and of the market in high art on the other hand. We might read Tree's ostensible lack of interest in the nuts and bolts of production financing in a similar way.[7] Tree's intervention in the debates on the actor-manager system aims to distance the actor-manager from market forces, to which detractors of the system accuse him of bowing in order to make a profit. Instead, Tree posits the actor-manager as a servant to art, construing him as a sensitive fellow artist in relation to other actors rather than an indifferent employer of them. In his article he achieves this in part by linking drama and literature as equal arts. Responding to the specious criticism that no great English writers of the nineteenth century wrote for the stage, Tree provides a list of authors, from Coleridge and Tennyson to Dickens and Thackeray, who were also

dramatists. Actor-managers, he implies, participate in this proud tradition of artistic production in the English theatre. Actor-managers' aspirations, like those of writers and artists, are to be understood as noble rather than "sordid," their ends artistic rather than "money-grubbing," and their beings pure rather than "corrupt" (Tree 17). Contrary to mere managers, Tree argues, actor-managers care about more than the bottom line: "All our actor-managers have shown themselves less conservative, and have already done more to encourage art on the stage than the managers proper" ("Echoes" 1 Mar. 1895: 186).

Tree's production of plays and construction of Her Majesty's Theatre in 1896-97 reflected this insistent repudiation of the marketplace. In the late 1890s, Tree engaged Lawrence Alma-Tadema, by that time a revered Royal Academician whose name connoted high art, to design backdrops, costumes, and props for many of his plays. His 1898 production of Julius Caesar, the first of many large-scale Shakespeare productions, featured "the lush background of Alma-Tadema's Rome" (Bingham 97). The play was an apt selection for staging a month after the conclusion of Queen Victoria's jubilee. As Bingham points out, "the British were conscious of the analogy of their Empire with that of the Roman world and many of them equated those virtues of the stoic father and the Roman matron with those of their race" (Bingham 98). Alma-Tadema's designs won adulation and the play turned a profit of £11,000 during a five-month run. Although the grandeur of Tree's new theatre would have been impossible without such profits, Tree was careful to conceal any overt manifestations of monetary exchange within the theatre. Her Majesty's boasted luxurious décor, but audiences were invited to imagine themselves less as customers paying for the privilege of viewing this décor than as guests at a

fashionable salon. Bingham refers to the new theatre as "Tree's temple of art" (Bingham 91), and this metaphor is apt given his artistic pretensions for the role of the actor-manager and for his productions. Unlike other venues, there was no charge for programmes at Her Majesty's, nor did they contain any advertising. The Grand Opera House programme with which I began this chapter included numerous advertisements, some of which took advantage of the play's theme or plot to flog advertised wares. Not so Tree's new programmes, which nowhere permitted audience members to imagine themselves merely as consumers. Access to cloakrooms was also provided free of charge, furthering the illusion that audience members were not customers but guests.

This is not to suggest that Her Majesty's Theatre did not produce for its audience members a spectacle of conspicuous consumption. To the contrary, David Schulz's careful research on the construction and architecture of Her Majesty's Theatre suggests the extent to which Tree's theatre "functioned as a place for the active production of a commodity spectacle onstage and in the auditorium, the lobbies, bars, and corridors" (Schulz 232). Like new department stores in the same neighbourhood, late-Victorian West End theatres provided audience members of various classes an occasion not merely to purchase goods, but, just as importantly, to see them. Whereas department stores like Harrod's and Whiteley's produced a "dream of wealth" (Schulz 233) by means of commodity display, West End theatres produced a similar dream in which goods were differently displayed—either on stage or "on the bodies of other audience members" (Schulz 233). As Schulz points out, the mix of classes in the theatre—from the wealthy elite in the stalls or the dress circle to the lower middle classes in the pit, the gallery, or the upper circles—belied the extent to which the theatre catered to the privileged Society

audience members who occupied the best seats in the stalls or the boxes closest to the stage. Like other West End theatres of the time, Her Majesty's managed its 1600 audience members by segregating them according to class: the five sections of the theatre had separate entrances and no intermingling occurred in the theatre apart from the viewing of others from one's seat. Schulz reads this architecture and the theatre's décor, with its emphasis on the Louis XIV style often on display in Victorian aristocrats' homes, as evidence of the theatre's "embodiment of a cultural rhetoric deployed on behalf of the wealthy elite to maintain their cultural hegemony" (Schulz 234).

Décor was an important component of display in Her Majesty's as in other theatres. Its emphasis on Louis XIV style was not the only mode of conveying the idea that the theatre was less a site of exchange than a private residence, and audience members guests rather than consumers. In the fashion of nineteenth-century manorial homes, Tree covered most walls with paintings of himself in famous roles and scenes from various company productions. As Schulz points out, Tree managed in this way to establish a proud genealogy for himself and for the company, and to assert his inheritance as a leading actor-manager of the day. The architecture of the theatre reinforced the presentation of the theatre as a manorial home rather than a site of exchange. Contrary to other commercial theatres whose entrances were mere porticos facing the street and whose buildings occupied space behind the commercial storefronts of neighbouring structures, Her Majesty's occupied a prominent position on the streetcorner. Built of stone, the theatre featured rows of windows (common to homes rather than commercial theatres) and a large cupola which housed Tree's own office and apartment. Both the architecture and the décor of the theatre facilitated audiences' perceptions that they were

guests at Tree's luxurious "temple of art" rather than paying customers at a theatrical entertainment.

That Tree aimed to represent himself as an actor-manager with a commitment to art rather than profits is clear in critical commentaries from the 1890s. Often singled out as the "Heir-Apparent" (Bettany "Mr. and Mrs. Tree" 75) to Henry Irving, whose stature as an actor-manager of integrity was unsurpassed, Tree was acknowledged for "his rare gifts" (Bettany "Mr. and Mrs. Tree" 76) and his ability to "[gather] round him at his theatre a company superior to any in London" (Bettany "Policy" 185). But this admiration often hinged on the extent to which Tree was perceived to cast aside profit-making in the service of advancing the reputation of the English stage.

In an article in Theatre on "The Policy of Our Leading Managers," W.A. Lewis Bettany considered "the attitude of our leading managers towards the advanced movement in dramatic art" (Bettany "Policy" 183) and identified Tree as "one of the few managers of the day who has any ideas and initiative of his own" (Bettany "Policy" 184). But all too often, complained Bettany, "Mr. Tree's claims as an artist" were limited to "stage decoration and ensemble"; "that he merits equal praise in respect of the plays he has produced at the Haymarket cannot so readily be allowed" (Bettany "Policy" 184). In debates about "the liberal movement in dramatic art," Tree had proven himself "something of a fair-weather friend. He has coquetted with the movement rather than definitely thrown in his lot with it; he has made capital . . . out of it, rather than helped it forward" (Bettany "Policy" 184). Bettany thus accused Tree of taking advantage of debates about the new movement in English drama to promote his commitment to art even as his selection of plays betrayed his motivations as pecuniary.

The roster of plays produced by the Haymarket in the year before Tree's acquisition of the English stage rights to Trilby lends some credence to Bettany's hesitations about Tree's motivations. In October 1894, the Theatre announced in "Echoes from the Green Room," its regular gossipy column on theatre-related events and personalities, that Tree's company was "doing very good business" ("Echoes" 1 Oct. 1894) on its provincial tour. Tree had chosen to mount Ibsen's An Enemy of the People alongside Hamlet and Sydney Grundy's A Bunch of Violets. By 1895, productions of Ibsen were not as risqué as they had been in the early 1890s, when the Independent Theatre Society staged the first English production of Ghosts. Ibsen had accrued some measure of cultural legitimacy, but, more importantly, had been a topic of heated public debate in the context of the new drama and its moral implications. Sydney Grundy, too, was implicated in these debates as the author of The New Woman (1894), a comedy which, according to one reviewer, had "the object of proving … that the 'new' is, after all merely a recognizable variation of the 'old'" (Watson 161).[8] Although An Enemy of the People is less explicitly concerned with the question of the modern woman's role than other plays like A Doll's House or Hedda Gabler, it nonetheless, by virtue of its authorship, was implicated in debates about modernity in the theatre and the limits of the representable on stage. One reviewer, trying hard to nail down the characteristics of Ibsen's enthusiasts in England, explained that Ibsenites harboured "a devout reverance for the New Woman" (Waring 164).[9] Grundy's The New Woman, contrary to Ibsen's work but in keeping with more conservative representations of the New Woman such as Grant Allen's novel The Woman Who Did (1894), manifested a more skeptical view of the New Woman. The authors of two of Tree's selections thus had in common their

participation in then-current debates about "the new," whether about the role of the theatre or of women.

It was not only in his selection of plays that Tree was sometimes perceived to walk a fine line between a commitment to art and an attention to the bottom line. In debates about "the modern society play," Tree occupied an ambivalent role for critics. When a correspondence erupted in the Times on the subject of "the Modern Society Play," the Theatre lamented that "there is no subject of public controversy on which more ignorance and irrelevance can be displayed in a given space," with the lone exception of "the subject of the nude in art" ("Modern" 1). The occasion of the correspondence was Tree's production of Haddon Chambers's John-a-Dreams, the story of a fallen woman who goes on to marry. The Theatre editorial criticized these "jeremiads" ("Modern" 2) against the play in the Times, commenting that John-a-Dreams might be understood as part of a movement away from the sensational English drama of the past and "towards a more serious portraiture of contemporary society" ("Modern" 3). Whereas correspondents in the Times and H.D. Traill in a Nineteenth Century article lambasted the production as "an outrage on the modest ear of the public" ("Modern" 4), the Theatre advocated this kind of frank treatment of "the darker aspects of humanity" ("Modern" 4).

One criticism of this new frankness on the stage was that it did not bespeak a sincere commitment to new forms of artistic production, but instead constituted a mere ploy by the actor-manager to draw audiences to the theatre. The Theatre noted the ire of some detractors of such drama; they were "certain that the 'Modern Society Play' would be unheard of if the actor-manager had not sold himself to Mammon" ("Modern" 2). Drama critic Clement Scott, an intractable opponent of Ibsen's subject matter,

approached the controversy over John-a-Dreams from a different angle, insisting that popularity and aesthetic success could not be equated. Scott perceived as "absolutely monstrous [the] theory that because a play is temporarily successful therefore it is artistic, that therefore it is in good taste, that therefore it is a credit to the stage, and that therefore 'the public' has pronounced in its favour" (Scott 6). Tree's correspondence in the University of Bristol Theatre Collection indicates that he was on friendly terms with Scott, with whom he corresponded about information on productions for Scott's regular "Dramatic and Musical" columns. But Scott's contribution to the controversy nonetheless isolates the balancing act that Tree performed in his public representation as a handservant to art.

As public responses to John-a-Dreams suggest, the accusation of immorality on the stage was widespread at a moment when proponents of frank dramatic representations of modern life found themselves at loggerheads with the proponents of stricter regulation of stage productions. Moralists like Laura Ormiston Chant, whose famous campaign against the supposed indecency of London music halls has been documented by John Stokes, sought more stringent systemic regulation and censorship by the Lord Chamberlain. At the same time that such moralists hoped to broaden the parameters of such regulatory bodies as the London County Council to include music halls along with theatres, advocates of the new drama hoped to reinvigorate what they perceived as a moribund English theatre by broadening its dramatic subject matter. Although the aims of these advocates—people like Elizabeth Robins, George Moore, and J.T. Grein of the Independent Theatre Society—were admirable and focused on intellectual and aesthetic

rigour, moralists worried about the corrupting effects of such subject matter as the frank treatment of gender and sexual relations.

Clement Scott perceived a third way of reading the production of the new drama: that these debates over the aesthetic value or corrupting influence of such drama covered over its money-making potential. As Scott remarked, the intimation of immorality sold tickets: "crowds of frivolous women and callow school-girls have flocked like birds of prey to any subject that was reported to be high or tainted" (Scott 6). Scott rejected Tree's claim to art, arguing that John-a-Dreams was "obviously inartistic" (Scott 8). Instead, he suggested, Tree had capitalized on the taint of immorality as a means of flogging the production. Although "there is nothing immoral in [the play]" (Scott 8), "the Haymarket play John-a-Dreams has been cleverly boomed as an immoral and distasteful work" (Scott 6). Scott was not alone in his suggestion that Tree had taken advantage of the controversy over the play. He quoted another commentator of a similar mind:

> Why, the other day they were discussing the authorship of the "X.Y.Z." letter in The Times. I heard a cynical brother-manager observe: 'There can be only one man who could have written it!' 'Who was that?' 'Herbert Beerbohm Tree; he is clever enough to start the discussion in order to answer himself and carry it on to completion'" (Scott 7).

Scott himself charged that Tree had taken advantage of the script as an occasion to employ Mrs. Patrick Campbell, whose previous brilliant success in The Second Mrs. Tanqueray boded well for box office receipts. Tree's production of John-a-Dreams, he suggested, provided an opportunity for the actress to reprise the role of "a woman with a nasty past" (Scott 8) which had made a smash hit of Pinero's play. But he warned against

interpreting Tree's decision to mount the play as a manifest commitment to the new drama. Dismissing any strictly aesthetic or intellectual motivations, Scott insisted the decision "has much more to do with commerce" (Scott 8). Finally, Scott argued, Tree leapt into the fray of debate because it suited his financial interests:

> Mr. Beerbohm Tree is a veritable Laodicean. He can blow hot and cold with the best of them. Yesterday he was ridiculing and scornfully dispraising the 'blear-eyed majority.' To-day he is apparently justifying the artistic use and public benefit of the Modern Society Play on the strength of this very majority, no longer blear-eyed so long as it has vision keen enough to walk straight to the Haymarket box-office.

Not all reviewers were adherents of the Modern Society Play. Critics of "the modern society drama," with its "easy, gentlemanly, emotional acting" (Parker 88), lamented the passing of the earlier stage convention of more deliberate enunciation and delivery. This theatrical debate between "the modern society drama" and older dramatic forms, including melodrama, paralleled the literary debate between the new naturalism and residual literary forms, including romance. Should actors adopt a naturalistic style in order to reflect more accurately everyday lived experience? Or should they maintain the more deliberate conventions that demarcate the stage as such? Gilbert Parker synopsized the criticism of the new naturalistic mode:

> It is not acting to do exactly as one does in real life, else there were no need of grease paints and lime-light, of pronounced colors, of careful arrangement of exits and entrances, of the illusive machinery of the stage. Everything that is done in life and imitated on the stage must be accentuated before the foot-lights, and if the

> accent is the result of a convention, which itself is the result of generations of experience and tradition, a certain dignity and largeness which in our more trivial and unromantic era are declining are given to the presentation. (Parker 88).

Although Tree's production of Trilby clearly did not aim for naturalism in its characterizations, it did aim to reproduce accurately Du Maurier's illustrations, which had been such a popular component of the original novel. Whereas the company's performances, especially Tree's performance as Svengali, drew on stage conventions associated with melodrama, the actual production, in its studied fidelity to the novel, was almost a parody of the much debated naturalist method in its strict adherence to the novel's descriptions and illustrations of characters. The Daily Chronicle's review of the opening night production at the Haymarket remarked, for example, that the characters in the play were exact replicas of Du Maurier's characters, especially Tree's Svengali.

The most widely noted alteration to the novel, however, was the production's emphasis on Svengali rather than Trilby. As the Morning Post reviewer stated, "the substance of [Potter's] plot [is] not the natural love of his heroine but the mesmeric power of Svengali" (Tree Archive, Press Cuttings). The Standard concurred with this synopsis of the play's altered focus: "Mr. Potter's play may [...] claim to be named Svengali" (Tree Archive, Press Cuttings). Although the Evening News lamented that "the preponderating influence of Svengali, the Jew musician and hypnotist, is as detrimental to the symmetry of the play as to its equipoise," it lauded Tree's incarnation of Svengali as "artistically nervous, loathsome, and repellent" (Tree Archive, Press Cuttings). Indeed, it continued, "the entire performance is one of the finest, more powerful, most picturesque, and uncanny Mr. Tree has given" (Tree Archive, Press Cuttings).

Although he ostensibly lacked a head for business, Tree clearly understood the asset that was his own drawing power as an actor in character roles even as he sought to consolidate his position as a producer of cutting-edge theatre. In a crusty review of Trilby, George Bernard Shaw complained that Tree's famously popular turn as Svengali required no more depth of characterization than a false nose and the appropriate grease paint: "His tours de force in the art of make-up do not impose on me: any man can get into a wicker barrel and pretend to be Falstaff, or put on a false nose and call himself Svengali" (qtd. in Donaldson 150-51). That his role as Svengali continued to fund the company and the eventual construction of Her Majesty's was not lost on Tree. On the occasion of the hundredth performance of Trilby in 1896, one journal noted, "Mr. Beerbohm Tree, although reported to be pining for intellectual relief in the Higher Drama, is as dramatic and picturesque as ever as the scoundrel Svengali—one of his best pieces of character-acting" (unidentified source, Tree Archive, Press Cuttings). With its roots in melodrama, Tree's production of Trilby at once foregrounded his role as Svengali over other characters and drew on contemporary stereotypes of the Jew to achieve its popularity. In the next section I situate Tree's portrayal in relation to these stereotypes, showing how Tree departed from Du Maurier's and Potter's previous texts to stake out the role that would bring him popular and financial success.

Svengali and the Jewish Question

As Sander Gilman has pointed out, "the terms 'Jew' and 'Christian' [took on] racial as well as religious significance from the eighteenth through the twentieth centuries" (Jew's Body 6). In the nineteenth century, when acculturated English Jews sought political emancipation and Disraeli served as Prime Minister, the term "Jew" also took on

political connotations. In this section I explore various understandings of Jewish identity in the nineteenth century, taking my cue from Gilman in my ultimate emphasis on Tree's racialized performance of Svengali as Jewish from 1895 onward. As periodical press representations of Jews in the 1880s make clear, increased immigration and the depressed English economy are two important contexts for understanding the vilification of Jews not only in the popular media but also in Tree's stage production. Before passing on to this analysis, however, I want to focus briefly on the debates about Jewish identity that precede Tree's representation at the *fin de siècle*. In order to provide an adequately historicized reading of Tree's representation, I want first to respond to the following questions: What were the nineteenth-century literary and cultural precedents for representing Jewish identity that informed Tree's performance? And what was the relationship of these representations to the increasingly urgent calls for political emancipation on the part of Jews themselves?

The Jewish Question has a history in the nineteenth century that long precedes late-Victorian debates about and representations of Jews in Great Britain. Since the expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290 by Edward I, no legislation existed to deal specifically with the question of Jewish rights in relation to mainstream institutions. This lack of legislation was "an insurmountable constitutional barrier to the assumption of full civil rights" (Katz vii). As recent historians have pointed out, Whiggish histories of Anglo-Jewry in the first half of the nineteenth century have, since the late nineteenth century, focussed on the attainment of such civil rights. In these histories, 1858 marks the watershed year of Emancipation—the "grandiose term" (Katz viii) for the right of an elected Member of Parliament to take his seat in the House of Commons without

swearing a Christian oath. Lionel de Rothschild's assumption of his parliamentary seat on 26 July 1858 thus represents Jewish political emancipation in the nineteenth century and the apotheosis of Anglo-Jewish agitation for full civil rights.[10] That Rothschild never uttered a single speech during his parliamentary career is of little importance in Whiggish histories that culminate in his accession to parliament. Similarly, his wealth, and therefore his similar class privilege to his fellow MPs and his exceptionality from the majority of English Jews, merited little attention in progress narratives of nineteenth-century Jewish emancipation.

Before the late-Victorian period, the Jewish Question focussed on the desirability and the means of assimilating British Jews into mainstream society and institutions. As Amanda Anderson has articulated, "the struggles for political emancipation of the Jews acutely raised the question of how desirable or possible it would be for Jewish communities and individuals to resist a fuller cultural assimilation into Christian states or predominantly Christian societies" (39). This question was debated in two distinct yet often intersecting print communities: the Jewish community itself, which published a variety of periodicals including the Jewish Chronicle, and the mainstream media, in which anti-Semitic representations frequently rubbed shoulders with apologies for Jewish emancipation.

The field of Jewish cultural studies has recently emerged as an important site for critical work on Jewish identity in the nineteenth century as represented in both of these communities. This project of mapping nineteenth-century Jewish identity has been marked, like the identity it seeks to map, by debate. As Nadia Valman has commented, "twentieth-century political, social, and literary histories of Anglo-Jewry, . . . published at

times of considerable pressure on Jews" (237), elided post-Victorian history in order to posit a progress narrative of nineteenth-century representations of Anglo-Jewry. From Cecil Roth's important History of the Jews in England (1941) and Montagu Frank Modder's The Jew in the Literature of England (1939) to Linda Gertner Zatlin's more recent study of The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Novel (1981), Valman contends, Anglo-Jewish historiography and literary history have been "underpinned by a progressive narrative which emphasized British tolerance, Jewish adaptation, and the transcendence of both native prejudice and ethnic insularity through culture" (238). Valman chides Linda Nochlin for similarly eliding developments in the field of Jewish cultural studies—including the interrogation of the idea of "a 'coherent Jewish identity'" (236) in the nineteenth century. But Nochlin's formulation of the relationship not only between Jewish identity and modernity but also between Anglo-Jewish identity and English anti-Semitism in the nineteenth century is useful. As Nochlin notes,

> The modern construction of the Jew and the establishing of a coherent Jewish identity may be said to have begun with the construction of modernity itself, in the nineteenth century. This construction is almost synchronous with, though hardly identical to, the growth of mass communication and the possibility of popular representation on a large scale. This fabric of Jewish identity is interwoven with the complex formation of anti-Semitism as an ideological position. Indeed, one might say that Jewish identity and the Jew of anti-Semitism are brought into being by the same representational trajectory. (qtd. in Valman 235)

There is a voluminous and fascinating body of critical work on Jewish attitudes toward emancipation and assimilation in the nineteenth century. In the field of literary studies, in particular, recent critics have undertaken the recovery of fiction, poetry, and journalism by writers like Grace Aguilar, showing how these writers addressed (sometimes separately, sometimes simultaneously) both Anglo-Jewish and Christian audiences on the subjects of religious tolerance and Jewish history. For the purposes of this chapter, however, my interest lies generally in non-Jewish responses toward emancipation and assimilation and specifically in the role of "popular representation" as identified by Nochlin. In the truncated analysis which follows, I leave to one side the question of Jewish self-identification and self-representation in order to concentrate on the representation of "the Jew" in mainstream literature and culture. Critics like Edgar Rosenberg have carefully mapped the extent of anti-Semitic representations in mainstream Victorian society. But just as histories of nineteenth-century Anglo-Jewry posit a teleological narrative of reform and assimilation, so too do narratives like Rosenberg's flatten out the contours of nineteenth-century representations of the Jew. As recent critics like Amanda Anderson, Brian Cheyette, and Sander Gilman have indicated, "the Jew" was not only a stigmatized identity in mainstream literature and culture but also a contested discursive site at which coalesced questions of national British identity and claims to modernity. In what follows, I examine a limited variety of mainstream representations of Jewish identity—ranging from political cartoons in Punch to literary representations, both stereotypical and sympathetic—in order to provide a spectrum of representation within which to locate Du Maurier's and Tree's characterizations. Because Disraeli's career spanned so many years of the Victorian period, mainstream periodical

responses to his Jewishness are instructive as a measure of mainstream preoccupation with the question of Jewish identity. After briefly alluding to these cartoons, along with Punch's other representations of the Jewish Question, I go on to consider two other Victorian literary works which figure the Jew: Dickens's Oliver Twist (1837-39) and Eliot's Daniel Deronda (1876). I consider these works as alternate models for the representation of Jewish identity in the nineteenth century. Rather than locating these representations on a continuum of anti-Semitism, I want instead to posit them as two distinct but not mutually exclusive possibilities for assimilating the Jewish Question into mainstream literature and culture in the nineteenth century.

Todd M. Endelman and Tony Kushner have recently devoted an entire collection of essays to the question of Disraeli's Jewishness. Anthony Wohl's contribution, "'BenJuJu': Representations of Disraeli's Jewishness in the Victorian Political Cartoon," argues forcefully that his Jewish identity continued to impact his political career even after Jewish emancipation in 1858. Whereas previous critics have suggested that "the prejudices he experienced as a schoolboy and as an aspiring politician. . . evaporated, or at least went underground, during his great ministry of 1874 to 1880" (105), Wohl demonstrates "that Disraeli's Jewishness assumed far greater political and social significance during his second ministry than at any previous stage in his career" (105): "He was portrayed as the archetypical or paradigmatic Jew, widely stereotyped and caricatured as the personification of, the icon for, the allegedly sinister and alien qualities of international Jewry" (106).

Even before Jewish emancipation in 1858, Punch engaged in the regular caricaturing of Jews in its cartoons. Pre-emancipation cartoons include illustrations to

accompany verses and articles like "The King of Saxony and the Jew Jewellers" (Punch 7 (1844): 201) and "Young Israel in Parliament" (Punch 13(1847): 241). In these cartoons, the Jew is inevitably figured as Shylock, as a money lender who threatens to profit unfeelingly from the exploitation of others. This association continues throughout the 1850s in the years leading up to Jewish emancipation, although these later cartoons increasingly rely not on the figure of Shylock for the Jew's recognition as such, but on his swarthy complexion and prominent nose. These are the features which identify the Jew as such in allegorical cartoons like "The Last Appeal (Against Jewish Disabilities)" (Punch 14 (1848)); "The Jew Bailiff's Complaint" (Punch 16 (1849): 104); "A Gentleman in Difficulties" (Punch 19)1850)); "The Dealer in Old Clothes" (Punch 20 (1851)); "Selling Off" (Punch 20 (1851)); and "Scene from Ivanhoe" (Punch 33 (1857)). In these cartoons the Jew stands in synecdochally for all Jews seeking parliamentary reform.

At a moment when liberals and Liberal MPs like Macaulay alike were using "social and moral arguments to support the extension of citizenship to the Jews" (Steyne 44), it is perhaps surprising that a reformist writer like Dickens would seize upon the figure of the Jew as an embodiment of criminality.[11] As Dickens later explained, he had not intended to castigate all Jews. To the contrary, he insisted, "I have no feeling towards the Jews but a friendly one. . . . I always speak well of them, whether in public or private, and bear my testimony (as I thought to do) to their perfect good faith in such transactions as I have ever had with them" (Letters qtd. in Johnson 1011). This defensive stance was a response to a letter he received in 1863 from Eliza Davis, "the wife of the gentleman who had bought Tavistock House" (Johnson 1010), Dickens's former residence. Davis wrote

to him, explaining that "Jews regarded his portrayal of Fagin in Oliver Twist as 'a great wrong' to their people" (Johnson 1010). Having similarly been accused of excluding Jews from his reformist sympathies by the Jewish Chronicle in 1854, Dickens determined to remonstrate. Not only did he respond to Davis in the letter I have already quoted, but he also included an explicitly sympathetic portrayal of Jewish characters in Our Mutual Friend, his then-current project. Dickens's heroine Lizzie Hexam seeks refuge in the employment of a group of generous and kind Jews, one of whom decries the conflation of all Jews: "'[Men] take the lowest of us as presentations of the highest; and they say 'All Jews are alike'" (qtd. in Johnson 1012). Dickens was gratified when, years later, Davis presented him with a Hebrew and English Bible in which she had inscribed a dedication, recognizing his attempt to right the perceived wrong of his representation. He expressed how her words "assure me that there is nothing but good will left between you and me and a people for whom I have a real regard, and to whom I would not wilfully have given an offense or done and injustice for any worldly consideration" (qtd. in Johnson 1012).

As Juliet Steyn has explained, Dickens defended his representation of Fagin to Eliza Davis on the grounds of realism: "Fagin in Oliver Twist is a Jew," Dickens insisted, "because it unfortunately was true of the time in which the story refers, that that class of criminal almost invariably was a Jew" (qtd. in Steyn 42). In the April 1841 Preface to the third edition of the novel, Dickens makes clear his adherence to a realist aesthetic. He criticizes the romanticization of criminals and thieves in previous literature, including Gay's Beggar's Opera; although he admires Gay's "witty satire on society" (xxvi), Gay's representation of "canterings upon moonlit heaths, [… and] merry-makings in the snuggest of all possible caverns" (xxvi) is at odds with the life of thieves that Dickens has

witnessed. Dickens aims instead to render social service by representing as accurately as possible the life of criminals in London:

> It appeared to me that to draw a knot of such associates in crime as really do exist; to paint them in all their deformity, in all their wretchedness, in all the squalid poverty of their lives; to shew them as they really are, for ever skulking uneasily through the dirtiest paths of life, with the great, black, ghastly gallows closing up their prospect, turn them where they may it appeared to me that to do this, would be to attempt a something which was greatly needed, and which would be a service to society. And therefore I did it as I best could. (Dickens xxvi)

Just as he defends his representation of Nancy on the grounds of veracity, so too does Dickens defend to Eliza Davis his representation of Fagin as a Jew. Responding to criticism of the crudeness of Nancy's character, Dickens responds, "It is useless to discuss whether the conduct and character of the girl seems natural or unnatural, probable or improbably, right or wrong. IT IS TRUE" (Dickens xxviii). Similarly, Fagin's Jewishness is perceived by Dickens as merely an accurately rendered component of his criminality.

Despite Dickens's protestations, the linkage between criminality and Jewish identity was not simply a fact of early Victorian life. It was, rather, an identification the history of which well preceded the nineteenth century. Both Dickens and his illustrator George Cruikshank drew on a history of popular and literary representations of the Jew which comprised "the medieval construction of the Jew as demonic (with red hair, a large nose, and a toasting fork), of the Jew as child murderer (seeking rich offal), [and] of the Jew as 'avaricious,' harking back to Shylock) (Steyn 45).

Contrary to this stereotypical representation of the Jew, Daniel Deronda has often been read as a sympathetic treatment of the Jewish Question. Amanda Anderson reads Daniel Deronda as Eliot's major contribution to the Jewish Question. Although the novel has often been construed by critics as an idealistic contribution to these debates, Anderson argues forcefully "just how revisionist [Eliot] is in her constructions of Judaism and modernity" (41). Assuming "that Eliot's elaboration of a project of Jewish nationalism necessarily challenges the perception that Jews were unequal to the tasks of modernity," Anderson explores Eliot's representation of "two distinct understandings of the project of Jewish nationalism": "Deronda's nationalism persistently moves toward the universalist civic model of nationality often associated with John Stuart Mill and built on the principle of democratic debate, while Mordecai's follows the collectivist-romantic model issuing out of German idealism, and built on the more troubling model of a unified national will and a projected national destiny" (41).

Criminality and the Jew

By 1880, V.D. Lipman has estimated, there were approximately 60,000 Jews living in Great Britain, 46,000 of whom were settled in London. In the aftermath of the Russian pogroms, which began in 1881, this number steadily increased. Since the late eighteenth-century partition of Poland by Russia, Russian Jews had been primarily confined to a sliver of land on the western edge of the Russian empire, known as the Pale of Settlement. It was an "overcrowded and economically backward" territory (Lipman xv). But when Czar Alexander II was assassinated by a terrorist group that included a Jewess, Russian Jews were scapegoated and were driven from the land they had been occupying.[12] Pogroms, expulsions, and anti-Jewish economic measures were

implemented, forcing thousands of Jews from their homes westward. This Russian persecution resulted in mass emigration. Between 1881 and 1905, an average of 4,000 Russian-Jewish immigrants per year arrived in Great Britain, for an estimated total influx of 100,000 immigrants. Although the United States was often the destination of fleeing Russian Jews, even immigrants in transit to the US usually spent time in Great Britain because it was cheaper to travel from Hamburg to the US via Britain than to travel direct. As Lipman has remarked, two consequences of this mass immigration were an increase in overcrowded, Yiddish-speaking communities in big cities like London, Manchester, Leeds, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Glasgow, and the concentration of immigrants into a few occupations, including clothing, cap-making, foot wear, cabinet-making, and street trading. Whereas assimilation had been the previous trend for nineteenth-century British Jews, who sought to extend their mobility beyond the range of Jewish areas in cities and beyond a limited cadre of occupations, this late-Victorian wave of immigration reversed the trend of assimilation. Moreover, this wave of immigration, which coincided with the economic instability that plagued Britain throughout the 1880s and the consequent higher unemployment levels, threatened the popular sympathy that characterized early British reactions to the Jewish victims of Russian persecution. As Jewish immigrants continued to arrive, late-Victorian humanitarian sympathy was displaced by fears "of overcrowding, disease, increase in rents, lowering of wages, creating of unemployment for British workers, crime, and even the infiltration of anarchism" (Lipman xvi).

Two *causes célèbres* of the 1880s figured the Jew as a potentially dangerous and even bloodthirsty villain, both abroad and at home: the 1883 Hungarian investigation of supposed ritual murder by Jews at Tisza-Esslar and the 1888 Jack the Ripper murders in

London's Whitechapel district. The media representations of these events drew attention to the implication of Jews of Eastern European origins in heinous crimes. This emphasis on the potential danger of "foreign" Jews is noteworthy. As Sander Gilman has argued, the differentiation between the "foreign" Jew and the "native" Jew was an important boundary in the late-Victorian period. Benjamin Disraeli's terms as Prime Minister (1868; 1874-80) and the attendance of the Prince of Wales (the future King Edward VII) at the 1881 wedding of Leopold de Rothschild at a London synagogue were just two signs of the acculturation of British Jews (Jew's Body 122). In the aftermath of the Russian pogroms and increased Jewish immigration to Britain, and especially to London, these two *causes célèbres* functioned to manifest popular ambivalence about the relationship between "foreign" and "native" Jews. Popular representations of these *causes célèbres* registered the potentially deleterious effects on British citizens and the British nation of the influx of "foreign" Jews. In addition, they threatened to undermine the status of acculturated "native" British Jews by throwing into question not only their fidelity to the nation-state but also their ability to resist the malign influence of "foreign" Jews.

When a young Hungarian girl was murdered in Tisza-Esslar, local rumours circulated that she had been killed by Jews as part of a ritual sacrifice. Fifteen Jews were tried in June 1883 on charges of murder. In August, London's Graphic reported that "ignorant Hungarians still believe that the Jews use Christian blood for their Passover sacrifices, and this old tradition has served as excuse for an outbreak of that fierce hatred of the Jews which has lately caused so much suffering on the Continent" (qtd. in Cohen 158). The Graphic's coverage suggests how British media sympathized more readily with

the cause of persecuted Jews abroad than with the plight of immigrant Jews in Britain. The Illustrated London News dispatched correspondent and artist Joseph Pennell to Eastern Europe to report on the treatment of Jews in Russia. Although, as Anne and Roger Cohen remark, Pennell "produced a series of articles that are distinguished for their consistent basic nastiness" (Cohen 122), other media representations were more sympathetic.[13] Pennell's comments, however, do identify the ambivalence aroused by the figure of the Jew in the 1880s and early 1890s: "When we see him at a respectful distance, all our sympathies are stirred and we welcome any movement in his behalf. But the better we know him, the more anxious we are that someone else, not ourselves, should be chosen to solve his problem" (qtd. in Cohen 142).

The perceived problem of the "foreign" Jew was accorded substantial scrutiny in 1888-89, after the Whitechapel murders of prostitutes by "Jack the Ripper." Judith Walkowitz has explored in detail the media frenzy that attended the Ripper murders in the autumn of 1888, and both Walkowitz and Sander Gilman have investigated the images of the murderer that were propagated by contemporary media and, indeed, by police in the early stages of investigation. The murderer's image was "the caricature of the Eastern Jew" (Jew's Body 113). According to Gilman, "the official description of 'Jack' was of a man 'age 37, rather dark beard and moustache, dark jacket and trousers, black felt hat, spoke with a foreign accent'" (Jew's Body 113). The majority of the 130 men interrogated in the murder investigation were Jews. The police themselves were convinced that an East End Jew was responsible for the horrific murders. Policeman Sir Robert Anderson, the lead official in the case, later remarked in his memoir:

> One did not need to be a Sherlock Holmes to discover that the criminal was a sexual maniac of a virulent type; that he was living in the immediate vicinity of the scenes of the murders; and that, if he was not living absolutely alone, his people knew of his guilt, and refused to give him up to justice. [...] And the conclusion we came to was that he and his people were low-class Jews, for it is a remarkable fact that people of that class in the East End will not give up one of their number to Gentile justice. (qtd. in Jew's Body 115-16)

After a Jew was the first to discover the body of Catherine Eddowes on 30 September 1888 outside the International Working Men's Educational Club, there was nearly a riot in the East End. According to the East London Observer, "On Saturday the crowds who assembled in the streets began to assume a very threatening attitude towards the Hebrew population of the District. It was repeatedly asserted that no Englishman could have perpetrated such a horrible crime as that of Hanbury Street, and that it must have been done by a JEW—and forthwith the crowds began to threaten and abuse such of the unfortunate Hebrews as they found in the streets" (qtd. in Jew's Body 117).

The association of Jack the Ripper with East End working-class Jews was reinforced by visual representations in the popular media. The Illustrated Police News published an image of Jack the Ripper in profile in September 1888. The image emphasized the killer's dark moustache and beard, his evil stare framed by a dark arched eyebrow, and his hook nose. This image was remarkably similar to an illustration published in the IPN the same month, which figured the arrest of a Polish-Jewish shoemaker for the Whitechapel murders. The widespread assumption of the Ripper's identity as Jewish was made clear in letters received by the police, letters ostensibly sent

by the Ripper himself. Walkowitz has warned against ascribing this correspondence to the actual murderer; as she is careful to point out, there is no way to ascertain the veracity of these letters. Regardless of who penned the letters, whether the murderer or someone eager to take the credit, they indicate the popular theories and assumptions about the murderer: that the murderer was a butcher, a Jew, and/or a foreigner. One 1889 note to Scotland Yard read:

> I'm not a butcher, I'm not a Yid
>
> Nor yet a foreign skipper,
>
> But I'm your own light-hearted friend,
>
> Yours truly, Jack the Ripper.

In their emphasis on the racialization and vilification of Svengali, critics have sometimes overlooked the important ways in which Jewishness is construed in relation to other characters in the novel, namely Little Billee. This is not to suggest that Du Maurier's representation of Svengali does not draw on available anti-Semitic stereotypes of the Jew; as my overview of periodical representations of "the Jew" has suggested, it does. Nor is it to disavow Du Maurier's implication in the promulgation of such stereotypes, a disavowal that Daniel Pick warns against in his criticism of Ormond's treatment of this aspect of the novel in her biography. My aim here is to suggest that Du Maurier's representation of Jewishness is both more complicated and conflicted than that of Tree's adaptation. In adapting the novel for the stage, Potter largely excised the discourses of art and science—specifically, musical genius and homeopathy—that inform Du Maurier's representation of Jewishness. Tree in turn rendered Svengali's racial identity a condition of his villainy by adding to Potter's script foreign language

expressions and by focussing on Svengali's powers of hypnotism, as I have shown in Chapter Three. Whereas Du Maurier's more complicated representation closely aligns Jewishness with both artistic genius and the panoply of predictable stereotypes associated with the stock figure of "the Jew" by the *fin de siècle*, Tree's interpretation merely iterates and builds upon his earlier roles as "the Jew." In his novel, I argue, Du Maurier conjoins artistic genius and Jewish villainy in the character of Svengali, who thereby comes to figure the artistic decadence of which Du Maurier was critical in his cartoons for Punch as elsewhere. By contrast, Tree's Svengali is less a complex symbol than a palimpsest of Tree's previous theatrical roles. Whereas Du Maurier's Svengali comes to symbolize a debate about art that is irreducible to his Jewishness, Tree's Svengali insistently reminds the audience that his Jewishness is a sign and condition of his villainy.

Tree's reply to Jones's critique of the actor-manager system in the Fortnightly Review is worth reiterating as a means of conjoining these figurations of "the Jew" and the actor-manager. Tree sketches a caricature of the actor-manager as detractors of this system of theatrical management perceive him. Such detractors advocate the establishment of more democratically governed theatres "to the exclusion of the actor-manager, whose aspirations are sordid, whose ends are money-grubbing, whose whole being is corrupt" (Tree 17). This is a crude caricature of the actor-manager as perceived by his opponents, but it could well describe Svengali as Tree portrays him in his stage production. Sordid, money-grubbing, and corrupt: these are the features that render Tree's Svengali so ominous and that threaten to impugn the reputation of the actor-manager at a moment when he could ill afford some implication in the marketplace.

---

[1] This regular feature of the Opera House program was, I imagine, similar to Punch's section of "facetiae" as I described it in Chapter 1. The 13-18 May 1895 program features the following dialogue, titled "Why He Named Her," on page 2:

Miss Wauterneau—Why do you call your dog Trilby, Mr Wagleigh?

Mr Wagleigh—A policeman hit her with one of those new concealed clubs the other day.

Miss Wauterneau—What has that to do with it?

Mr Wagleigh—Don't you see? She was struck with a Little Billy.

The 16-17 September 1895 program for "The Little Comedy Queen, Dollie Brooks in the Sensational Melodrama, Jerry" featured the following lyrics, titled "A Change of Hue," on page 13:

Oh, don't you remember sweet Alice, Ben Bolt?
Sweet Alice, with hair so brown?
She has used a new bleach and now she wears
The yellowest hair in town.

These lyrics were reproduced in subsequent programs as well, including those for 18-19 September 1895 and 21 November 1895. The 16-17 September 1895 program also featured, on the same page as "A Change of Hue," the following dialogue, titled "On the Bowery":

Customer (in a restaurant)—Bring one Welsh rarebit and an order of pig's feet.

Waiter (through slide)—One Taffy on a doorstep, one Trilby from the rooter!

The following dialogue, titled "Not Room Enough" appeared in the 14 October 1895, 8-9 November 1895, and 26 February 1896 programs:

Haverly—Trilby could never have been a Chicago girl.

Austen—Why not?

Haverly—Because she could never have posed for her foot altogether in one studio.

[2] The advertisement appears on page 7 of the 13-18 May 1895 program.

[3] As Frances Donaldson notes, "It is strange that a man who believed these things should have been the founder of the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art" (Donaldson 162-63). Tree founded the school in Gower Street in 1904. Theatrical hopefuls could study elocution, dancing, and fencing, and the most promising of the students were rewarded with acting jobs in Tree's company.

[4] For a detailed description of the performance at Balmoral, see Pearson 78-79.

[5] Other critics worried that the relationship between author and actor-manager was too symbiotic rather than antagonistic. One critic wrote in the Theatre, "This close connection between author and manager is a bad thing, it hampers and fetters both parties alike" (Bettany "Policy" 183).

[6] Tree publicly acknowledged the value of this "personal influence with the public" on the opening night of Her Majesty's Theatre. Moving downstage at the end of the play,

Tree expressed his gratitude directly to the audience: ". . . I have one great power behind me in that I have your goodwill and that of the Public" (qtd. in Bingham 91).

[7] Bingham similarly implies that Tree's ostensible lack of interest in reading and emphasis on inspiration were in part a performative stance. She describes his careful interpretation and staging of Antony's address scene from Antony and Cleopatra, which was inspired by reading Baring Gould's Tragedy of Caesar. She remarks, "This might seem odd for a man who purported never to read and to find his ideas by a sudden inspiration; it was hardly a part studied without reflections, or reflections made without study" (Bingham 97).

[8] For another review of The New Woman, see "At the Play. In London," Theatre 1 Oct. 1894: 186-87. The reviewer suggests that Grundy's representation of "the new sisterhood" is somewhat confusing, and that the "sketches of three 'advanced' women . . . are . . . so highly coloured . . . that in a great measure the circumstance deprives the author's satire of its sting" (187).

[9] The reviewer, Herbert Waring, was sympathetic to Ibsenism, having co-produced in 1893, with Elizabeth Robins, a series of matinees of The Master-Builder. See Waring 167.

[10] As Juliet Steyn points out, between 1830 and 1858 there were fourteen bills presented in an effort to remove parliamentary disabilities (309).

[11] For more on Macaulay's support for Jewish emancipation, see chapter 3 of Finestein, "A Modern Examination of Macaulay's Case for the Civil Emancipation of the Jews" (78-103).

[12] Popular novelist Hall Caine published "The Scapegoat" in the Illustrated London News, August-September 1891, which was "hailed by the most intelligent and influential members of the respectable Jewish community in London as a real service to the cause of justice and mercy" (Cohen 132).

[13] The Illustrated London News also dispatched popular novelist Hall Caine to Russia to investigate the extent of Russian persecution of Jews. According to the ILN, Caine accepted "the proposal of the Russo-Jewish Committee of London. . . to visit Russia for the purpose of ascertaining the facts with a view to fairly and faithfully illustrating the condition of the Jews in that country" (Cohen 132).

Afterword

By 1900, the vogue for Trilby had passed. Society women put away the Trilby brooches of naked left feet that had graced their collars, restaurants ceased flogging the Trilby sausages and ice cream delicacies that had once sold like hotcakes, and readers no longer added their names to long library waiting lists in the hopes of borrowing the novel. At the height of Trilby's popularity, New York's Mercantile Library reported that a hundred copies of the novel were in circulation. A librarian at the Chicago Public Library worried that the twenty-six copies in circulation there were failing to meet readers' demands. "'I believe we could use 260 and never find a copy on the shelves,'" he reported. "'Every one of our 54,000 card-holders seems determined to read the book'" (Gilder 22). Harpers capitalized on this popularity to market Du Maurier's final novel, The Martian (1896-97), after his premature death in October 1896. But by 1900, libraries had discarded excess copies of Trilby because of diminished demand, and Trilby enthusiasts had packed away copies of the Comparative "Trilby" Glossary (1895), their Trilby dolls, and their Trilby board games.

Despite its ephemeral nature, Trilby's phenomenal popularity in the mid-1890s tells us much not only about changing modes of production and advertising in a rapidly expanding literary marketplace, but also about changing definitions of professional identity at the *fin de siècle*. Other critics have mapped Trilby's popularity as a function of new or newly renovated forms of marketing, such as the emergent bestseller system (Purcell) or the refinement of a niche for illustrated books (Jenkins); as a product of the novel's engagement with late-Victorian discourses of sexuality and gender (Denisoff; Showalter); or as a result of the novel's representation of popular, hotly debated practices

and movements like hypnotism (Pick) and aestheticism (Grossman). Surely we may ascribe the novel's immense popularity to its simultaneous implication in each of these material and discursive matrices. My critical aim here has been to explain Trilby's additional implication in debates about a variety of emergent or contested professional identities at its moment of publication—the literary critic, the artist's model, the hypnotist, and the actor-manager. As my analyses have shown, late Victorians who assumed and who championed these professional identities had to work hard to contest the denigration of these identities because of their whiff of the marketplace and their association with popular practices and genres. And yet Trilby's legacy, in part, along with the eponymous fedora and the figure of Svengali, consists of its representation of and participation in debates about these contested identities.

In The Temple of Culture: Assimilation and Anti-Semitism in Literary Anglo-America (2000), Jonathan Freedman argues that the phenomenon of the literary mania, and specifically that of Trilby mania, provides a unique occasion for analysing readers' responses. Although "the empirical phenomenology of reader response . . . remains conjectural and murky" (Freedman, Temple 89), Freedman asserts that "Trilby the text and Trilby-mania the phenomenon" are valuable "for what they can tell us about the texture of responses evidenced by the new mass audience for fiction; for what the spectacularly labile response of that audience to Trilby tells us about its charged investment in the mythos and the practices of high culture; and, finally, for how that doubled response made its way with such spectacular force into representations of that culturally powerful image of doubleness, the Jew" (90). In Freedman's compelling analysis, Trilby accomplishes at once "the linkage of the Jew to the image of the high-

cultural artist" (90) and the tutoring of its reading audience in the appropriate "public reception of art" (100). The novel, he suggests, expresses "intense ambivalence on the question of the audience and the source of its extraordinary effect on an equally divided middlebrow public" (102):

> Through its representation of that audience, the novel simultaneously endorses and problematizes the idea of cultural enthusiasm itself; it sketches for its middlebrow audience a highbrow vision of a lowbrow audience response, but it does so in such a way as to render high and low indistinguishable from one another. In so doing, it both sketches and creates a space for a new form of cultural experience, that form I have been calling middlebrow. (103)

For Freedman, Du Maurier's novel is didactic to the extent that it instructed its audience how to respond to it. The enthuasiastic response of audiences to Trilby's operatic genius within the novel suggested how contemporary audiences could read the novel itself. Spellbound by Svengali, Trilby succeeds in spellbinding her audience. As I have suggested, the metaphor of hypnotism did indeed become a convenient, if mystifying, way to explain the novel's popularity among late-Victorian readers. In Freedman's analysis, the hypnotic effect of Trilby's performance and the commodification of Trilby in the novel figure the middlebrow cultural experience that was Trilby mania.

Freedman's critical interest is how Trilby mania marks the *fin de siècle* emergence of middlebrow culture and middlebrow readers, who are characterized by, among other emotions, "an uneasy combination of reverence for and insecurity in the face of the high cultural" (94). At the historical moment of "the rise of new professional/managerial classes in both England and America and [...] the concomitant

rise of a culture increasingly attuned to the ethos of consumption, [...] members of these new elites sought increasingly to legitimize themselves by invoking the authority of taste, aesthetics, and 'culture'" (93). Trilby may indeed mark the emergence of a new middlebrow culture, as Freedman argues. But its implication in narratives of late-Victorian professionalization also marks the increasing anxiety with which these professionals—literary critics, artists, medical hypnotists, and actor-managers—regarded the category of the popular. That the novel "represent[s] high and low as indistinguishable from one another" (103) may account, in part, for its reception in particular professional communities—like the medical community—where this collapse of high and popular culture threatened to undermine professional cultural authority.

The novel manifested and encouraged in readers a distinct nostalgia for Parisian studio culture of the late 1850s, with its cast of buoyant youths, their untutored artistic genius, and Bohemian lifestyle. This nostalgia, I have argued, implicitly occludes the role of the artistic marketplace in the consolidation of the artists' professional identities, which they achieve after they have left Paris. Rather than reading this representation of professional artistic identity as strictly a realistic portrait of studio culture in the 1850s, when Du Maurier, Whistler, Poynter, and others were apprentice artists, we might understand it as a valorization of artistic community over the artistic marketplace in this narrative of professional apprenticeship. Du Maurier's own apprenticeship, first in Gleyre's Paris studio and then among the illustrators at Punch, suggested that convivial bonhomie was an important condition for the production of saleable art. No less crucial was the exploitation of new technologies in print production and new reading audiences. As the marketing of Punch and Harper's marketing of Trilby make clear, such techniques

made possible marketing on a mass scale and, ultimately, the phenomenon that was Trilby mania. Yet the machinery of popular fiction was ostensibly disdained, even by literary critics who were inextricably implicated in it. Literary critics like Andrew Lang attempted to accrue cultural authority by disavowing their interest in the marketplace. As the institutionalization of English Literature at Oxford suggests, however, literary critics could not disavow this interest enough to legitimize their purchase on high culture, as sanctioned by the university. Although Du Maurier mocks art critics in Trilby, suggesting that, as failed artists, their careers are parasitic on real art, late-Victorian critics like Lang themselves contested the mutual exclusivity of the categories of art and criticism, of high and popular culture, even as they acknowledged the cultural barriers which impeded the transgression of these categories.

In the 1880s and 1890s, artists at once transgressed and reinforced the boundaries between high and popular culture in their bid for professional authority and cultural capital. Exploiting the popular fascination with Bohemian artists' lifestyles, respectable artists drew on the mythology of art studio apprenticeship to create suitably Bohemian pasts for themselves. To assert their lingering Bohemianism, artists decorated their studios in fashionable décor and peopled them with models. The model, however, threatened the respectable artist with unrespectable implications. Although her association with Bohemian identity secured the artist's Bohemian pedigree, it also risked undermining his claim to cultural authority. Artists wanted it both ways—to claim the model's Bohemian cachet but to disavow her Bohemian immorality. Ultimately, the model functioned to consolidate masculine artistic identity and community. The story of Trilby, its actual narrative and its publication history, illustrates this reliance on the

model for the establishment of masculine artistic identity and the commodification of Bohemia in the service of professional artistic advancement.

In debates about the popular practice of hypnotism, medical men of the same period aimed to consolidate their professional authority either by rendering hypnotism the purview of the medical profession or by disavowing hypnotism altogether as an illegitimate and fraudulent practice. Trilby, with its representation of Svengali's malevolent power of suggestion on the one hand and Trilby's hypnotic effect on her audience on the other hand, manifests both the negative and positive implications of hypnotism. Whereas Svengali's abuse of hypnotism permits him to exploit Trilby in potentially nefarious (and sexual) ways, Trilby's hypnotic effect on her listeners brings them the pleasure of high cultural experience. As I have remarked, the medical profession paid attention to fictional representations of hypnotism like that of Trilby, considering in its professional publications the verisimilitude of these representations in relation to empirical observations of hypnotism. These assessments of fictional representations of hypnotism suggested that only medical men possessed the refined knowledge of hypnotism necessary to determine the accuracy of such representations. Although such assessments asserted the medical profession's singular capacity to recuperate hypnotism from the clutches of entertainers in the service of legitimate medical therapy, the popular representation of the hypnotist as dangerous, foreign criminal exceeded the medical profession's capacity to recuperate either the practice of hypnotism or the figure of the hypnotist. The force of this popular representation necessitated the abandonment and repudiation of hypnotism by the late-Victorian medical profession, which was still working hard to consolidate its hard-won cultural and professional authority.

Whereas the figure of the hypnotist was disavowed by late-Victorian medical men seeking cultural and professional authority, it was exploited by Herbert Beerbohm Tree in his efforts to maintain and consolidate his reputation as a pre-eminent actor-manager at a moment when the managerial system of theatre organization was giving way to other forms of organization. An analysis of Tree's career in the 1890s suggests how careful he was to distance himself from any perceived pandering to the theatrical marketplace. His own theories of acting identify the successful actor as an artistic genius rather than a skilful worker, and his contributions to late-Victorian debates on the "actor-manager question" employ the earnest language of art and artistic inspiration rather than the language of the marketplace used by other contributors to these debates. Despite these measured and vocal efforts to value art over profit, Tree made a mint in the 1890s; his production of Trilby financed, in large part, the construction of a new theatre for his company and continued to finance the company's provincial tours well past the turn of the century. The popularity of this production hinged on Tree's famous incarnation of Svengali as a villainous hypnotist and Jew. Expanding on Du Maurier's representation of Svengali's Jewishness, Tree exploited then-current anxieties about Jewish identity and drew on the stock character of the Jew from melodrama to fashion a star vehicle for himself.

The implication of Trilby in these late-Victorian debates about professional identity suggests that Trilby's legacy is more than merely a hat or a villainous stereotype. Trilby and the Trilby phenomenon matter, in part, because of what they teach us about these cultural debates on professional identity and how these identities were frequently legitimized by the explicit exclusion or repudiation of popular figures, genres, and

practices. The recent proliferation of Trilby editions may similarly teach us about the discipline of English in our own historical moment. Largely ignored as popular (and passé) literature since the turn of the century, Trilby has only recently begun to garner critical attention in the academy. Just as the professional identities I have mapped out relied on the repudiation of popular figures, genres, and practices, so too did the discipline of English studies long rely on the repudiation of popular fiction like Trilby. We might consider Trilby, then, constitutive not only of the late-Victorian cultural debates and professional identities I have explored, but also of ongoing debates about the status and function of our own professional identities as scholars and critics of literature.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

"The Abuse of Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 21 May 1887: 1121.

Almy, Frederic, Walter Cary, John B. Olmsted, Minnott E. Robinson, and Carleton Sprague. Frilby: An Operatic Burlesque. Buffalo: Star Theater, 1895.

Arnold, Matthew. Culture and Anarchy. 1869. Ed. Samuel Lipman. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.

"Assault Upon a Hypnotist." Times 17 May 1898: 6.

"Assaulting a Hypnotist." Times 16 May 1898: 9.

"At the Play. In London," Theatre 1 Oct. 1894: 186-87.

A.T.Q.C. "A Literary Causerie. Hypnotic Fiction." Speaker 14 Sep. 1895: 316-17.

Bangs, John Kendrick. "Ballads of To-day. Trilby." Harper's Weekly 5 Jan. 1895: 18.

Besant, Walter. All Sorts and Conditions of Men. 1882. Ed. Elaine Showalter. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

---. Autobiography of Sir Walter Besant. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1902.

---. Herr Paulus: His Rise, His Greatness, and His Fall. London: Chatto and Windus, 1888.

Bettany, W.A. Lewis. "Mr. and Mrs. Tree at the Haymarket." Theatre 1 Feb. 1894: 75-83.

---. "The Policy of Our Leading Managers." Theatre 1 Apr. 1894: 182-90.

Bigelow, Poultney. "The Russian and His Jew." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (Mar. 1894): 603-14.

"Bohemians and Bohemianism." Cornhill Magazine 11 (Feb. 1865): 241-55.

Boothby, Guy N. A Bid for Fortune; or, Dr. Nikola's Vendetta. London: Ward, Lock, 1895.

Brandon, Margaret. Hypnotised: or, The Doctor's Confession. London: Hutchinson, 1891.

"The British Medical Association and Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 19 Feb. 1898: 513.

British Medical Journal. 1878-98.

Brontë, Charlotte. Jane Eyre. 1848. London: Penguin, 1966.

---. Villette. 1853. London: Penguin, 1979.

Brough, Robert. "Calmuck." Household Words 3 April 1858: 365-70.

Buchanan, Robert. "The Fleshly School of Poetry: Mr. D.G. Rossetti." Contemporary Review 18 (Oct. 1871): 334-50.

Buchanan, Robert, and Henry Murray. The Charlatan. Chicago: F. Tennyson Neely, 1895.

"The Chambige Trial." Times 12 Nov. 1888: 6.

Charcot, Jean-Martin. Clinical Lectures on Diseases of the Nervous System. Intro. Ruth Harris. London: Routledge, 1991.

---. "Hypnotism and Crime." Forum Mar. 1890: 159-68.

---. "Magnetism and Hypnotism." Forum Jan. 1890: 566-77.

Clark, A. Campbell. "Automatic Writing." British Medical Journal 6 Jan. 1894: 37.

"Clinical Society of Manchester." British Medical Journal 29 Nov. 1890: 1243.

Collins, John Churton. The Study of English Literature: A Plea for Its Recognition and Organization at the Universities. London: Macmillan, 1891.

Collins, Wilkie. Heart and Science. 1882-83. Ed. Steve Farmer. Peterborough: Broadview, 1998.

---. The Moonstone. 1868. Peterborough: Broadview, 1999.

"Crime or Madness." Lancet 8 Nov. 1884: 839.

"Criminal Responsibility." Times 4 Sep. 1894: 10.

"Criminal Responsibility." Times 8 Sep. 1894: 12.

"Criminal Responsibility." Times 14 Sep. 1894: 10.

"Criminal Responsibility," Times 19 Sep. 1894.

"Criminal Responsibility," Times 1 Oct. 1894: 2.

The Crowning of Music. Grand Opera House, London, Ontario. Season 1895-96. Regional History Room. D.B. Weldon Library, University of Western Ontario. London, Ontario.

Cuninghame, Caroline M. The Slave of His Will. London: Spencer Blackett, 1891.

Cushing, Paul. Doctor Caesar Crowl: Mind-Curer. London: John and Robert Maxwell, 1887.

"Daly's Theatre." Times 4 Feb. 1895: 8.

Danby, Frank [Julia Frankau]. Dr. Phillips: A Maida Vale Idyll. 1887. New York: Garland, 1984.

"Dangers of Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 17 Sep. 1887.

"Dangers of Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 28 Mar. 1891.

Davis, Albert E. "Hypnotism, Hysteria, Etc." British Medical Journal 17 Dec. 1892: 1375.

"Death of 'Frank Danby'." The Times [London] 18 March 1916: 11.

"The Death of Svengali." TB 14, fiche 936. Press Cuttings vol. 14 (Oct. 1895-May 1896). Herbert Beerbohm Tree Collection.

"Deaths under Chloroform." British Medical Journal 28 Mar. 1891: 714.

Dering, Ross George. Dr. Mirabel's Theory: A Psychological Study. London: Richard Bentley, 1893.

De Watteville, A. "Correspondence. Hypnotism and Crime." St. James's Gazette 21 Nov. 1888: 5.

Dickens, Charles. Oliver Twist. 1837-38. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Diehl, A.H. Dr. Paull's Theory: A Romance. New York: D. Appleton, 1893.

"Discussion on Sleep and Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 4 Sep. 1880: 381-83.

Dixon, Ella Hepworth. The Story of a Modern Woman. 1894. Intro. Kate Flint. London: Merlin, 1990.

"Dramatic Gossip." Athenaeum 9 Feb. 1895: 193.

Dumas, Alexandre. Memoirs of a Physician. Boston: Little, Brown, 1890.

Du Maurier, George. "Social and Pictorial Satire. I." Harper's New Monthly Magazine Feb. 1898: 331-44.

---. "Social and Pictorial Satire. II." Harper's New Monthly Magazine Mar. 1898: 505-21.

---. Trilby. Harper's New Monthly Magazine 27-28 (Jan.-July 1894).

---. Trilby. New York: Harper, 1894.

---. Trilby. Ed. Daniel Pick. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1994.

---. Trilby. Ed. Leonée Ormond. New York: Everyman, 1994.

---. Trilby. Ed. Elaine Showalter. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995.

---. Trilby. Ed. Elaine Showalter. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

"Echoes from the Green Room." Theatre 1 Mar. 1895: 184-88.

Eliot, George. Daniel Deronda. 1876. London: Penguin, 1993.

Ellis, Havelock. The Criminal. 1890. Montclair: Patterson Smith, 1973.

"Ernest Hart." British Medical Journal 15 Jan. 1898: 175-86.

"Ernest Hart." The Times 8 Jan. 1898: 6.

Ewart, C. Theodore. "The Power of Suggestion." Nineteenth Century Aug. 1890: 252-59.

Fane, Violet [Mary M.L.S. Currie]. The Story of Helen Davenant. New York: D. Appleton, 1889.

Felkin, R.W. Hypnotism or Psychotherapeutics. Edinburgh: Young J. Pentland, 1890.

"Foreign and Colonial News. The Chambige Trial." Times 12 Nov. 1888: 6.

"France." British Medical Journal 27 Mar. 1886: 613-14.

"France." Times 3 Jan. 1889: 5.

"France." Times 28 Jan. 1891: 5.

"France." Times 29 Jan. 1891: 5.

"France. Times 30 Jan. 1891: 5.

"France." Times 8 Feb. 1891: 5.

Gilder, J.B., and J.L. Gilder. Trilbyana: The Rise and Progress of a Popular Novel. New York: Critic, 1895.

Gissing, George. New Grub Street. 1891. London: Penguin, 1968.

"The Gouffé Murder." Times 18 Dec. 1890: 3.

"The Gouffé Murder," Times 19 Dec. 1890: 3.

"The Gouffé Murder," Times 20 Dec. 1890: 5.

Hall, Owen. An Artist's Model. A Comedy with Music. Lyrics by Harry Greenbank. Music by Sidney Jones. London: Hopwood and Crew, [1895].

Harper Collection (MA 1950 R-V 65 p. 12o-fo). Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.

Hart, Ernest. "The British Jews." Fraser's Magazine 49 (March 1854): 304-14.

---. "Hypnotism, Animal Magnetism, and Hysteria." British Medical Journal 3 Dec. 1892: 1215-20.

---. Hypnotism, Mesmerism and the New Witchcraft. New York: D. Appleton, 1896.

---. "The Hypnotism of 'Trilby'." British Medical Journal 26 Oct. 1895: 1052.

---. "The Hypnotism of 'Trilby'." British Medical Journal 2 Nov. 1895: 1117.

---. "The New Mesmerism. I-VI." British Medical Journal 14 Jan. 1893: 77-78; 21 Jan. 1893: 127-30; 28 Jan. 1893: 198-200; 4 Feb. 1893: 261-63; 11 Feb. 1893: 301-03; 18 Feb. 1893: 362-64.

---. "The Press, the Quacks, and the Public." British Medical Journal 27 Jan. 1894: 208.

---. "Schools and Doctrines of Hypnotism," British Medical Journal 28 Mar. 1891: 721-23.

"Haymarket Theatre." Standard 31 Oct. 1895. TB 14, fiche 936. Press cuttings vol. 14 (Oct. 1895-May 1896). Herbert Beerbohm Tree Collection.

Herbert Beerbohm Tree Collection. University of Bristol Theatre Collection.

Holmes, T. "In Memory of Ernest Hart." British Medical Journal 15 Jan. 1898: 176-77.

Humphreys, Eliza Margaret [Rita]. The Doctor's Secret. New York: John W. Lovell, 1890.

Huysmans, J.K. Against Nature. 1884. Trans. Robert Baldick. London: Penguin, 1959.

"Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 5 May 1888: 962.

"Hypnotism." Lancet 6 Aug. 1887.

"Hypnotism and Crime." St. James's Gazette 27 Nov. 1888: 5.

"Hypnotism as a Therapeutic Agent." British Medical Journal 6 May 1893: 954.

"Hypnotism in America." British Medical Journal 28 Feb. 1891: 475.

"Hypnotism in Dipsomania." British Medical Journal 13 Mar. 1897: 702.

Illustrated London News. 1886-89.

Innes, A. Taylor. "Hypnotism in Relation to Crime and the Medical Faculty." Contemporary Review Oct. 1890: 555-66.

"The Investigation of Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 28 Feb. 1891: 476-77.

Irving, Henry. "Actor-Managers. II." Nineteenth Century (June 1890): 1052-53.

James, Henry. The Bostonians. 1886. New York: Modern Library, 1956.

---. "George du Maurier." Harper's New Monthly Magazine Sep. 1897: 594-609.

---. Harper's Weekly 14 April 1894: 342.

Jones, Charlotte Rosalys. The Hypnotic Experiment of Dr. Reeves and Other Stories. London: Bliss, Sands and Foster, 1894.

Jones, Henry Arthur. "The Actor-Manager." Fortnightly Review 48.283 (1890):1-16.

Kerr, Norman. Should Hypnotism Have A Recognised Place in Ordinary Therapeutics? London: H.K. Lewis, 1890.

Kingsbury, George. "Hypnotism, Crime, and the Doctors." Nineteenth Century Jan. 1891: 145-53.

---. "Hypnotism, Hysteria, Etc." British Medical Journal 17 Dec. 1892: 1375.

---. The Practice of Hypnotic Suggestion: Being an Elementary Handbook for the Use of the Medical Profession. Bristol: John Wright, 1891.

---. "Public Hypnotic Demonstrations." British Medical Journal 14 Feb. 1891: 391.

Krafft-Ebing, Richard von. An Experimental Study in the Domain of Hypnotism. Trans. Charles G. Craddock. New York and London: G.P. Putnam, Knickerbocker P, 1889.

Lang, Andrew. "At the Sign of the Ship." Longman's Magazine 1882-94.

---. "A Bookman's Purgatory." Longman's Magazine 2.11 (Sep. 1883): 516-23.

---. "Matthew Arnold." Century Magazine 23 (1882): 849-64.

---. "The Merton Professorship." The Academy 20 June 1885: 438-39.

---. R-V Autographs Miscellaneous. 69 ALS addressed to Prof. Knight. Collection held by the Pierpont Morgan Library, New York.

"Latest Intelligence. The Gouffé Murder." Times 17 Dec. 1890: 5.

"Latest Intelligence: The Gouffé Murder." Times 22 Dec. 1890: 5.

"Latest Intelligence. Lyons." Times 11 Feb. 1891: 5.

Lilly, W.S. "The New Naturalism." Fortnightly Review (1 Aug. 1885): 240-56.

---. "The Philosophy of Crime." Contemporary Review (Feb. 1894): 221-38.

Lombroso, Cesar, and William Ferrero. The Female Offender. London: Peter Owen, 1959.

"The Looker-On." Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine 158.962 (Dec. 1895): 905-27.

Lusk, Lewis. "The Artistic Position of Du Maurier." Art Journal 1900: 337-40.

Luys, J. "The Latest Discoveries in Hypnotism. I." Fortnightly Review June 1890: 896-921.

---. "The Latest Discoveries in Hypnotism. II." Fortnightly Review Aug. 1890: 168-83.

Lynn, Neville. The Artist's Model; or, One at a Time. London: Capper and Newton, n.d.

Mackenzie, Tessa, ed. The Art Schools of London. 1895. London: Chapman and Hall, 1895.

Marsh, Richard. The Beetle. 1897. Dover: Alan Sutton, 1994.

Martineau, Harriet. Autobiography. Vol. 2 of 2 vols. 1877. Intro. Gaby Weiner. London: Virago, 1983.

"Masturbation Cured by Hypnotism." Supplement to the British Medical Journal 4 July 1891: 6.

Maugham, W. Somerset. Of Human Bondage. 1915. London: Penguin, 1992.

May, Betty. Tiger-Woman. My Story. London: Duckworth, 1929.

"Mesmerism, Alias Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 3 Apr. 1886: 654.

"Mr Langley on Mesmerism." British Medical Journal 22 Mar. 1884: 575.

"Mr. Ruskin on the Nude in Art." Pall Mall Gazette 27 May 1885: 4.

"Models." Times 13 Oct. 1885: 6.

"Models and Morals. I." Pall Mall Gazette 9 Oct. 1885: 4-5.

"Models and Morals. II." Pall Mall Gazette 10 Oct. 1885: 1-2.

"Models and Morals. III." Pall Mall Gazette 13 Oct. 1885: 6.

"Modern Demoniacs." Times 5 Feb. 1880: 8.

"The Modern Society Play." Theatre 1 Jan. 1895: 1-4.

Moll, Albert. Hypnotism. Contemporary Science Series. Ed. Havelock Ellis. London: Walter Scott, 1890.

Monkhouse, Cosmo. "Some English Artists and Their Studios." Century Magazine 24 Aug. 1882: 553-68.

"M. Luys and Hypnotism." Lancet 10 Sep. 1887: 547-48.

Moore, George. A Modern Lover. London: Tinsley, 1883.

---. "A New Censorship of Literature." Pall Mall Gazette 10 Dec. 1884: 1-2.

National Vigilance Association. "Pernicious Literature." Documents of Literary Realism. Ed. George J. Becker. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963. 350-82.

"The New Crusade." Pall Mall Gazette 12 Oct. 1885: 8, 12.

"The New Crusade." Pall Mall Gazette 16 Oct. 1885: 11.

"The New Mesmerism." The Times 28 Dec. 1892: 2.

"Nude Studies." Times 22 May 1885: 5.

---. Times 23 May 1885: 16.

---. Times 25 May 1885: 10.

---. Times 28 May 1885: 4.

"Obituary. Mr. Andrew Lang." The Times 22 July 1912: 11.

Oliphant, E.H.C. The Mesmerist. London: Eden Remington, 1890.

Pall Mall Gazette. 1885.

"The 'Pall Mall Gazette' and the Public." Pall Mall Gazette 10 July 1885: 8.

"The 'Pall Mall Gazette' and the Public." Pall Mall Gazette 11 July 1885: 8.

Parker, Gilbert. "Herbert Beerbohm Tree." Harper's Weekly 26 Jan. 1895: 88.

Phillips, Barnet. "Trilby—The Art Side Only." Harper's Weekly (9 Mar. 1895): 222.

Potter, Paul. "Trilby." Trilby and Other Plays: Four Plays for Victorian Stage Actors. Ed. George Taylor. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996. 204-71.

"Psychology: Or What?" British Medical Journal 13 Aug. 1881: 305-06.

"Public Exhibitions of Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 24 Nov. 1888: 1175-76.

Punch. 1841-1900.

Ransome, Arthur. Bohemia in London. 1907. Intro. Rupert Hart-Davis. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1984.

"Restriction of Hypnotic Performances," British Medical Journal 31 May 1890: 1264.

Rev. of The Use of Hypnotism in Chronic Alcoholism by C. Lloyd Tuckey. British Medical Journal 10 Apr. 1897: 923.

Robertson, George M. "The Use of Hypnotism Among the Insane." British Medical Journal 27 Aug. 1892: 460.

"Royal Academy of Medicine in Ireland." British Medical Journal 9 May 1891: 1023-24.

Sangster, Margaret. "'Trilby' from a Woman's Point of View." Harper's Weekly 38 (Sep. 1894): 883.

Schönberg, James. The Comparative "Trilby" Glossary. New York: J. Hovendon, 1895.

Scott, Clement. "The Modern Society Play." Theatre 1 Jan. 1895: 6-10.

Sims, George R. My Life: Sixty Years' Recollections of Bohemian London. London: Eveleigh Nash Company, 1917.

Stephens, F.G. Artists at Home. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, and Rivington, 1884.

Stetson, Philip S. "How Mr. Potter Wrote 'Trilby'." Metropolitan Magazine 1.4 (May 1895): 235-41.

Stevenson, Robert Louis. "A Gossip on Romance." Longman's Magazine 1 (Nov. 1882): 69-79.

Stoker, Bram. "Actor-Managers. I." Nineteenth Century (June 1890): 1040-51.

Stuart, Esmé [Amélie Claire Leroy]. In His Grasp. London: W.H. Allen, 1887.

"Telephonic Hypnotism." British Medical Journal 23 Jan. 1886: 164.

Times. 1885.

"Tragedy in Algeria." Times 9 Nov. 1888: 5.

Tree, Herbert Beerbohm. "The Actor-Manager. A Stage Reply." Fortnightly Review 48.283 (1890): 16-19.

"Trilby." Evening News 31 Oct. 1895. TB 14, fiche 936. Press Cuttings vol. 14 (Oct. 1895-May 1896). Herbert Beerbohm Tree Collection.

Tuckey, Charles Lloyd. "The Applications of Hypnotism." Contemporary Review Nov. 1891: 672-86.

---. "Correspondence. Hypnotism and Crime." St. James's Gazette 28 Nov. 1888: 6.

---. "The Value of Hypnotism in Chronic Alcoholism" British Medical Journal 27 Aug. 1892: 459-60.

"University Intelligence. Oxford, March 9." The Times 10 Mar. 1885: 11.

University of Victoria Archives and Special Collections, Ernest Dowson Fonds, 96-101, Correspondence 1895-1912.

Waring, Herbert. "Ibsen in London." Theatre 1 Oct. 1894: 164-69.

Watson, Malcolm. "Mr. Grundy and the Critics." Theatre 1 Oct. 1894: 161-64.

W.B.H. "The Dramatization of 'Trilby.'" Harper's Weekly 6 April 1895: 326.

Wilde, Oscar. "London Models." English Illustrated Magazine Jan. 1889: 313-19.

---. The Picture of Dorian Gray. 1890. Peterborough: Broadview, 1998.

"A Woman's Plea." Times 20 May 1885: 10.

---. Times 21 May 1885: 6.

Wyndham, Charles. "Actor-Managers. III." Nineteenth Century (June 1890): 1054-58.

Secondary Sources

Ainger, Alfred. "Du Maurier, George Louis Palmella Busson." Dictionary of National Biography. Supplement. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1921-22. 586-91.

---. "George du Maurier in Hampstead." Hampstead Annual 1897. 12-19.

Altick, Richard. The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900. 1957. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1998.

---. Punch: The Lively Youth of a British Institution 1841-1851. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1997.

---. The Scholar Adventurers. New York: Macmillan, 1950.

Anderson, Amanda. "George Eliot and the Jewish Question." Yale Journal of Criticism 10.1 (1997): 39-61.

Arata, Stephen. Fictions of Loss in the Victorian *fin de siècle*: Identity and Empire. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Auerbach, Nina. Woman and the Demon. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1982.

Bacon, Alan. "English Literature Becomes a University Subject: King's College, London as Pioneer." Victorian Studies 29.4 (1986): 591-612.

Bader, Arno L. "Those Mesmeric Victorians." Colophon 3.3 (1938): 335-53.

Bailey, Peter. Popular Culture and Performance in the Victorian City. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

---. "Parasexuality and Glamour: The Victorian Barmaid as Cultural Prototype." Gender and History 2.2 (1990): 148-72.

Baldick, Chris. The Social Mission of English Criticism 1848-1932. Oxford: Clarendon, 1987.

Bartrip, Peter. "The British Medical Journal: A Retrospect." Medical Journals and Medical Knowledge: Historical Essays. Ed. W.F. Bynum, Stephen Lock, and Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1992.

Bartrip, P.W.J. Mirror of Medicine: A History of the British Medical Journal. Oxford: British Medical Journal and Clarendon P, 1990.

Bax, Clifford. Ideas and People. London: Lovat Dickson, 1936.

Beer, Gillian. Darwin's Plots. 1983. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.

Bingham, Madeleine. "The Great Lover": The Life and Art of Herbert Beerbohm Tree. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1978.

Black, Eugene. The Social Politics of Anglo-Jewry 1880-1920. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Blagden, Cyprian. "Longman's Magazine." Review of English Literature 4.2 (1963): 9-22.

Borzello, Frances. The Artist's Model. London: Junction Books, 1982.

Boyarin, Daniel. Unheroic Conduct: The Rise of Heterosexuality and the Invention of the Jewish Man. Berkeley: U of California P, 1997.

Brantlinger, Patrick. "Bohemia Versus Grub Street: Artists' and Writers' Communities in Nineteenth-Century Paris and London." Mosaic 16.4 (1983): 25-42.

---. The Reading Lesson: The Threat of Mass Literacy in Nineteenth-Century British Fiction. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1998.

Bryan, William J. Legal Aspects of Hypnosis. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1962.

Burns, Sarah. Inventing the Modern Artist: Art and Culture in Gilded Age America. New Haven: Yale UP, 1996.

Bynum, W.F., and Janice C. Wilson. "Periodical Knowledge: Medical Journals and Their Editors in Nineteenth-Century Britain." Medical Journals and Medical Knowledge: Historical Essays. Ed. W.F. Bynum, Stephen Lock, and Roy Porter. London: Routledge, 1992. 29-48.

Cherry, Deborah. Painting Women: Victorian Women Artists. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Cheyette, Bryan. Construction of "the Jew" in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875-1945. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1993.

---. "Neither Black Nor White: The Figure of "the Jew" in Imperial British Literature." The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity. Eds. Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995. 31-41.

Codell, Julie F. "Constructing the Victorian Artist: National Identity, the Political Economy of Art and Biographical Mania in the Periodical Press." Victorian Periodicals Review 33.3 (2000): 283-316.

---. "Serialized Artists' Biographies: A Culture Industry in Late Victorian Britain." Book History 3 (2000): 94-124.

Cowen, Anne, and Roger Cowen. Victorian Jews Through British Eyes. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

Court, Franklin. Institutionalizing English Literature: The Culture and Politics of Literary Study, 1750-1900. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1992.

Cunningham, Valentine. "Darke Conceits: Churton Collins, Edmund Gosse, and the Professions of Criticism." Grub Street and the Ivory Tower: Literary Journalism and Literary Scholarship from Fielding to the Internet. Ed. Jeremy Treglown and Bridget Bennett. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1998. 72-90.

Daly, Nicholas. Modernism, Romance, and the *fin de siècle*: Popular Fiction and British Culture, 1880-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

Davidoff, Leonore. The Best Circles: Society Etiquette and the Season. London: Croom Helm, 1973.

Davis, Tracy C. Actresses as Working Women: Their Social Identity in Victorian Culture. London: Routledge, 1991.

Dellamora, Richard, ed. Victorian Sexual Dissidence. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999.

Demoor, Marysa. "Andrew Lang, Crusader on Behalf of Romance," Studia Germanica Gandensia 20 (1979): 87-104.

Denisoff, Dennis. "'Men of My Own Sex': Genius, Sexuality, and George Du Maurier's Artists." Victorian Sexual Dissidence. Ed. Richard Dellamora. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999. 147-69.

Devereux, Cecily. "'A Strange, Inverted World': Interpreting 'The Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' in English Canada." Essays on Canadian Writing 62 (1997): 46-64.

Dickstein, Morris. Double Agent: The Critic and Society. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1992.

Dingwall, Eric J. Introduction and Acknowledgements. Abnormal Hypnotic Phenomena: A Survey of Nineteenth-Century Cases. Vol. 4 of 4 vols. London: J. & A. Churchill, 1968. vi-vii.

---. "Hypnotism in Great Britain 1800-1900." Abnormal Hypnotic Phenomena: A Survey of Nineteenth-Century Cases. Vol. 4 of 4 vols. London: J. & A. Churchill, 1968. 80-164.

Donaldson, Frances. The Actor-Managers. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970.

Doyle, Brian. "The Hidden History of English Studies." Re-Reading English. Ed. Peter Widdowson. London: Methuen, 1982. 17-31.

Du Maurier, Daphne. Introduction. The Young George du Maurier: A Selection of His Letters, 1860-67. Ed. Daphne du Maurier. Garden City: Doubleday, 1952. ix-xxi.

Dunae, Patrick. "Penny Dreadfuls: Late Nineteenth-Century Boys' Literature and Crime," Victorian Studies 22.2 (1979): 133-50.

Erdman, Harley. Staging the Jew: The Performance of an American Ethnicity, 1860-1920. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1997.

Feldman, David. Englishmen and Jews: Social Relations and Political Culture 1840-1914. New Haven: Yale UP, 1994.

Feltes, N. N. Literary Capital and the Late Victorian Novel. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1993.

Finestein, Israel. Jewish Society in Victorian England. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 1993.

Frazier, Adrian. George Moore 1852-1933. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.

Freedman, Jonathan. Professions of Taste: Henry James, British Aestheticism, and Commodity Culture. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1990.

---. The Temple of Culture: Assimilation and Anti-Semitism in Literary Anglo-America. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

French, Richard D. Antivivisection and Medical Science in Victorian Society. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.

Frierson, William C. "The English Controversy over Realism in Fiction 1885-1895." PMLA 48 (1928): 533-50.

Furniss, Harry. Some Victorian Women: Good, Bad, and Indifferent. London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1923.

Gauld, Alan. A History of Hypnotism. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

Gilman, Sander L. The Jew's Body. New York: Routledge, 1991.

---. "Salome, Syphilis, Sarah Bernhardt and the 'Modern Jewess.'" German Quarterly 66.2 (1993): 195-211.

Gluck, Mary. "Theorizing the Cultural Roots of the Bohemian Artist." Modernism/Modernity 7.3 (2000): 351-78.

Gölz, Sabine I., and Oleg V. Timofeyev, trans. "Hypnotism and Medicine in 1888 Paris: Contemporary Observations by Sofia Kovalevskaya." Sub-Stance 79 (1996): 3-23.

Gorham, Deborah. "The 'Maiden Tribute of Modern Babylon' Re-examined: Child Prostitution and the Idea of Childhood in Late-Victorian England." Victorian Studies 21.3 (1978): 353-78.

Green, Roger Lancelyn. Andrew Lang, A Critical Biography. Leicester: Edmund Ward, 1946.

Gross, John. The Rise and Fall of the Man of Letters: Aspects of English Literary Life Since 1800. 1969. London: Penguin, 1991.

Hamilton, Susan. "'Still Lives': Gender and the Literature of the Victorian Vivisection Controversy." Victorian Review 17.2 (1991): 21-34.

Harris, Ruth. Introduction. Clinical Lectures on Diseases of the Nervous System. By Jean-Martin Charcot. Ed. Ruth Harris. London: Routledge, 1991. xviii-lxviii.

---. "Murder under Hypnosis in the Case of Gabrielle Bompard: Psychiatry in the Courtroom Belle Epoque Paris." The Anatomy of Madness: Essays in the History of Psychiatry. Vol. 2 of 3 vols. Ed. W.F. Bynum, Roy Porter, and Michael Shepherd. London: Tavistock, 1985. 197-241.

"Hart, Ernest." Dictionary of National Biography. Supplement. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1921-22. 821-22.

"Hart, Ernest." Who Was Who, 1897-1915. London: A. & C. Black, 1920. 318.

Hartman, Donald. "Hypnotic and Mesmeric Themes and Motifs in Selected English-Language Novels, Short Stories, Plays and Poems, 1820-1983." Bulletin of Bibliography 44.3 (1987): 156-66.

Hillman, Robert G. "A Scientific Study of Mystery: The Role of the Medical and Popular Press in the Nancy-Salpêtrière Controversy on Hypnotism." Bulletin of the History of Medicine 39.2 (1965): 163-82.

Hoffeld, Donald R. "Mesmer's Failure: Sex, Politics, Personality, and the Zeitgeist." Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences 16 (1980): 377-86.

Hutchinson, Horace. Portraits of the Eighties. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1920.

Jackson, Donald Dale. "You Will Feel No Pain." Smithsonian 29.12 (March 1999): 126-40.

Jackson, Holbrook. The Eighteen Nineties. 1913. New York: Knopf, 1922.

Johnson, Edgar. Charles Dickens: His Tragedy and Triumph. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1952.

Jones, Aled. Powers of the Press: Newspapers, Power and the Public in Nineteenth-Century England. Aldershot: Scolar P, 1996.

Kaplan, Fred. Dickens and Mesmerism: The Hidden Springs of Fiction. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1975.

---. "'The Mesmeric Mania': The Early Victorians and Animal Magnetism." Journal of the History of Ideas 35.4 (1974): 691-702.

Katz, David S. The Jews in the History of England 1485-1850. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1994.

Keep, Christopher. "The Cultural Work of the Type-Writer Girl." Victorian Studies 40.3 (1997): 401-26.

Kent, Christopher. "The Idea of Bohemia in Mid-Victorian England." Queen's Quarterly 80 (1973): 360-69.

---. Introduction. British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1913. Ed. Alvin Sullivan. Westport: Greenwood P, 1984. Xiii-xxvi.

"Lang, Andrew." Dictionary of National Biography 1912-21. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1927. 319-23.

Langstaff, Eleanor De Selms. Andrew Lang. Boston: Twayne, 1978.

Laurence, Jean-Roch, and Campbell Perry. Hypnosis, Will, and Memory: A Psycho-Legal History. New York: Guilford, 1988.

Lerner, Paul. "Hysterical Cures: Hypnosis, Gender and Performance in World War I and Weimar Germany," History Workshop Journal 45 (1998): 79-101.

Lipman, V.D. "Introduction: The Victorian Jewish Background." Victorian Jews Through British Eyes. By Anne and Roger Cowen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986. xi-xix.

"Longman's Magazine, 1882-1900." The Wellesley Index to Victorian Periodicals 1824-1900. Ed. Walter Houghton. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1987. 430-37.

Lucas, E.V. "George Du Maurier at Thirty-Three." Cornhill Magazine Oct. 1934: 385-410.

Macleod, Dianne Sachko. Art and the Victorian Middle Class: Money and the Making of Culture. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.

Maurer, Oscar. "Andrew Lang and Longman's Magazine, 1882-1905," University of Texas Studies in English 34 (1955): 152-78.

McClintock, Anne. Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest. New York: Routledge, 1995.

McConachie, Bruce A. "Historicizing the Relations of Theatrical Production." Critical Theory and Performance. Ed. Janelle G. Reinelt and Joseph R. Roach. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1992. 168-78.

Millar, J.H. "Andrew Lang." Quarterly Review 218.435 (1913): 299-329.

Nochlin, Linda. "Starting with the Self: Jewish Identity and Its Representation." The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity. Ed. Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995. 7-19.

Ohmann, Richard. Selling Culture: Magazines, Markets, and Class at the Turn of the Century. London: Verso, 1996.

Orel, Harold. Victorian Literary Critics. London: Macmillan, 1984.

Ormond, Leonée. George du Maurier. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

---. "Hogarth, William." Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens. Ed. Paul Schlicke. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999. 274-75.

Owen, Alex. The Darkened Room: Women, Power and Spiritualism in Late Victorian England. London: Virago, 1989.

Palfreman, Jon. "Between Scepticism and Credulity: A Study of Victorian Scientific AttitudesModern Spiritualism." On the Margins of Science: The Social Construction of Rejected Knowledge. Ed. Roy Wallis. Sociological Review Monograph 27 (Keele: U of Keele, 1979): 201-36.

Palmer, D.J. The Rise of English Studies. London: Oxford UP/University of Hull, 1965.

Parssinen, Terry M. "Mesmeric Performers." Victorian Studies 21.1 (1977): 87-104

---. "Professional Deviants and the History of Medicine: Medical Mesmerists in Victorian Britain." On the Margins of Science: The Social Construction of Rejected Knowledge. Ed. Roy Wallis. Sociological Review Monograph 27 (Keele: U of Keele, 1979): 103-20.

Pearson, Hesketh. Beerbohm Tree, His Life and Laughter. New York: Harper, 1956.

Peterson, M. Jeanne. The Medical Profession in Mid-Victorian England. Berkeley: U of California P, 1978.

---. "Victorian Periodicals and the Professions: Medicine." Victorian Periodicals and Victorian Society. Ed. J. Don Vann and Rosemary VanArsdel. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1994. 22-44.

Pick, Daniel. "Powers of Suggestion: Svengali and the *Fin-de-Siècle*." Modernity, Culture and 'the Jew'. Ed. Bryan Cheyette and Laura Marcus. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998. 105-25.

---. Svengali's Web: The Alien Enchanter in Modern Culture. New Haven: Yale UP, 2000.

Postle, Martin, and William Vaughan. The Artist's Model from Etty to Spencer. London: Merrell Holberton, 1999.

Primeau, Ronald. "Longman's Magazine." British Literary Magazines: The Victorian and Edwardian Age, 1837-1913. Ed. Alvin Sullivan. Westport: Greenwood P, 1984. 209-13.

Punch George Du Maurier Centenary Number. 7 Mar. 1934.

Pykett, Lyn. "Representing the Real: The English Debate About Naturalism, 1884-1900." Naturalism in the European Novel: New Critical Perspectives. Ed. Brian Nelson. New York: Berg, 1992.

Ragussis, Michael. Figures of Conversion: "The Jewish Question" & English National Identity. Durham: Duke UP, 1995.

Reid, Forrest. "Andrew Lang and 'Longman's'." London Mercury 37.221 (1938): 502-08.

---. Illustrators of the Eighteen Sixties. 1928. New York: Dover, 1975.

Richardson, Joanna. The Bohemians: La Vie de Bohème in Paris 1830-1914. New York: A.S. Barnes, 1969.

Rose, Jonathan. "Osgood, McIlvaine and Company." Dictionary of Literary Biography 112. Detroit: Gale. 240-41.

Rosenberg, Edgar. From Shylock to Svengali: Jewish Stereotypes in English Fiction. Standford: Stanford UP, 1960.

Roth, Michael. "Hysterical Remembering." Modernism/Modernity 3.2 (1996): 1-30.

Russo, Mary J. The Female Grotesque: Risk, Excess, and Modernity. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Ruth, Jennifer. "'Gross Humbug' or 'the Language of Truth'? The Case of the Zoist." Victorian Periodicals Review 32.4 (1999): 299-323.

Salmon, Richard. "Signs of Intimacy: The Literary Celebrity in the 'Age of Interviewing.'" Victorian Literature and Culture (1997): 159-77.

Schulz, David. "The Architecture of Conspicuous Consumption: Property, Class, and Display at Herbert Beerbohm Tree's Her Majesty's Theatre." Theatre Journal 51.3 (1999): 231-50.

Shteir, Ann. Cultivating Women, Cultivating Science: Flora's daughters and botany in England, 1760-1860. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.

Showalter, Elaine. Introduction. Trilby. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995. ix-xxiii.

Simler, Barbara. Illustrated British Novels, 1800-1899. Catalogue to an Exhibition Curated by Barbara Simler. University of Alberta, 2001.

Smith, Alison. The Victorian Nude: Sexuality, Morality and Art. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1996.

Smith, Roger. Trial By Medicine: Insanity and Responsibility in Victorian Trials. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1981.

Spielmann, M.H. The History of 'Punch'. London: Cassell, 1895.

Springhall, John. "'Pernicious Reading'? 'The Penny Dreadful' as Scapegoat for Late-Victorian Juvenile Crime," Victorian Periodicals Review 27.4 (1994): 326-49.

Steyn, Juliet. "Charles Dickens' Oliver Twist: Fagin as Sign." The Jew in the Text: Modernity and the Construction of Identity. Eds. Linda Nochlin and Tamar Garb. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995. 42-56.

Subject Index of the Modern Works Added to the Library of the British Museum in the Years 1881-1900. Ed. G.K. Fortescue. London: British Museum, 1903.

Sutherland, John. The Stanford Companion to Victorian Fiction. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1989.

Tatar, Maria M. Spellbound: Studies on Mesmerism and Literature. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.

Taylor, George. Players and Performances in Victorian Theatre. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1989.

Taylor, Jenny Bourne. In the Secret Theatre of Home: Wilkie Collins, Sensation Narrative and Nineteenth-Century Psychology. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Valman, Nadia. "Manly Jews: Disraeli, Jewishness and Gender." Disraeli's Jewishness. Eds. Todd M. Endelman and Tony Kushner. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002. 62-101.

---. "Semitism and Criticism: Victorian Anglo-Jewish Literary History." Victorian Literature and Culture 27.1 (1999): 235-48.

VanArsdel, Rosemary T. "Mrs Florence Fenwick-Miller and The Woman's Signal, 1895-1899." Victorian Periodicals Review 15.3 (1982): 107-18.

Wakeman, Geoffrey. Victorian Book Illustration: The Technical Revolution. Newton Abbot: David and Charles, 1973.

Walkley, Giles. Artists' Homes in London, 1764-1914. Aldershot: Scolar P, 1994.

Walkowitz, Judith R. Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1980.

Waterfield, Robin. Hidden Depths: The Story of Hypnosis. London: Macmillan, 2002.

Wearing, J.P. The London Stage, 1890-1899: A Calendar of Plays and Players. 2 vols. Metuchen: Scarecrow P, 1976.

Weatherall, Mark W. "Making Medicine Scientific: Empiricism, Rationality, and Quackery in Mid-Victorian Britain." Social History of Medicine 9.2 (1996): 175-94.

Weintraub, Joseph. "Andrew Lang: Critic of Romance." English Literature in Transition 1880-1920 18.1 (1975): 5-15.

West, Shearer. "The Construction of Racial Type: Caricature, Ethnography, and Jewish Physiognomy in Fin-de-Siècle Melodrama." Nineteenth-Century Theatre 21.1 (1993): 4-40.

Wiener, Martin J. Reconstructing the Criminal: Culture, Law, and Policy in England, 1830-1914. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Winter, Alison. Mesmerized: Powers of Mind in Victorian Britain. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.

Wohl, Anthony S. "'Ben JuJu': Representations of Disraeli's Jewishness in the Victorian Political Cartoon." Disraeli's Jewishness. Eds. Todd M. Endelman and Tony Kushner. London: Vallentine Mitchell, 2002. 105-61.

Wynne, Catherine. "Mesmeric Exorcism, Idolatrous Beliefs, and Bloody Rituals: Mesmerism, Catholicism, and Second Sight in Bram Stoker's Fiction." Victorian Review 26.1 (2000): 43-63.

Zatlin, Linda Gertner. The Nineteenth-Century Anglo-Jewish Novel. Boston: Twayne, 1981.